

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

IF the Book of Daniel was not written by the man whose name it bears, why does it bear his name? That question has never been answered till now. And being unanswered, it has had much to do with the determination to hold by Daniel as the author. There are difficulties undoubtedly. Throughout the whole book you breathe an historical atmosphere that is centuries later than the time of Daniel. But there is always this fact, that the book declares itself written by the Prophet Daniel. And the Christian conscience has found it hard to get over that fact.

But the question has been answered now. Professor R. H. CHARLES has issued a new edition of his Jowett lectures. The title is the same as before, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (A. & C. Black; 10s. 6d. net). And in most respects the new edition is the same as the old. It differs in one respect. Since he delivered the Jowett Lectures, Dr. CHARLES has made a fresh and comprehensive study of the whole subject of anonymity and pseudonymity, and he has discovered why the Book of Daniel was attributed to Daniel though not written by him.

The question was the more difficult to answer that all apocalyptic is not pseudonymous. In particular—and this is an important matter—there are apocalypses in the New Testament. There is

the Johannine Apocalypse, and there is the short Pauline apocalypse of the second chapter of Second Thessalonians. The New Testament apocalypses are not pseudonymous. They bear their own authors' names. It is necessary to show why apocalyptic writings before Christ were attributed to other than their true authors, and why that ended with Christianity.

The first thing to be observed is that much of the Bible bears no author's name at all. It is anonymous. For 'the Hebrew writer was almost wholly devoid of the pride of authorship, and showed no jealousy as to his literary rights.' He did not seek favour for his own name: he desired only to exalt the name of Jehovah. A post-exilic writer could therefore adopt the work of pre-exilic writers and recast it to suit the needs of his own time, without being at all careful to distinguish its authorship. He could even take the work of a prophet and introduce into it fragments of prophecy whose authorship was unknown. And in doing so he not only committed no outrage, he served his generation well. More than that, he served our generation. For it is sure enough that if these anonymous prophecies which we find in Isaiah had not been introduced into the writings that bore the name of that prophet they would have perished. Such insertions were really pseudonymous. But the question is not answered yet.

Nor does GUNKEL answer the question when he points out that much of the material found in books like Daniel was derived from really ancient traditions already current under the names of Daniel, Enoch, Noah. The final editor of such traditions, says GUNKEL, being conscious that he had not originated but only reinterpreted these traditions, might reasonably feel justified in attaching to his work an ancient name associated with such traditions. In this view, says Professor CHARLES, there is a very slight substratum of truth. For to a certain extent the apocalypstist did re-edit and re-publish earlier traditions. But it is wholly inadequate to explain the adoption of pseudonymity.

---

There came a time in Israel when all religious writings were divided into three classes, the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. And there came a time when each of these classes was held to be complete. The Canon of the Law was closed first. It was closed by the end of the age of Ezra and Nehemiah. Next, the Canon of the Prophets was closed. It was closed about 200 B.C. The Hagiographa was not considered complete for a century later.

---

Now, as soon as the Canon of the Law was closed, no law-book could be admitted as of authority. And not only so, but no prophetic or holy book could be admitted as of authority if it differed from or added to the Law. If, therefore, any new prophecy appeared claiming recognition, it was first of all scrutinized for its attitude towards the Law. If its attitude to the Law was inoffensive it might be added to the roll of the Prophets, provided its appearance was before 200 B.C. If it appeared between 200 and 100 B.C. it might still be added to the Hagiographa.

---

But what chance would a new prophecy have of consideration at all at a time when the minds of men were set rather on stereotyping the past than on recognizing the Spirit of God in the present? There was one chance. If a book came bearing

the name of one of the great prophets of the past it would at once be granted examination. Well, the Book of Daniel came. It came under the name of a well-known prophet. It had its chance. It came after the Law was fixed, and there were in it things that were at least suspicious to the strictly legal mind. Still, there was the great name of Daniel. It was not admitted into the Canon of the Prophets, for the prophetic Canon was already closed. But sometime in the second century B.C. it was admitted into the Canon of the Hagiographa.

---

The Hulsean Lectures for 1911-12 were delivered by the Rev. Reginald J. FLETCHER, D.D., Preacher of Gray's Inn. They have been published by Messrs. Bell & Sons under the title of *Dei Christus, Dei Verbum* (3s. 6d. net).

---

The lecturer is sensitive to the criticism which has recently been made upon doctrinal Christianity. He is especially sensitive to the distinction which has been drawn between the historical Jesus and the theological Christ. He thinks that we must face that criticism. And in facing it he believes that we shall find it necessary to acknowledge the distinction as in fact true, and to adjust our theology accordingly.

---

Dr. FLETCHER, we say, believes that the distinction suggested by the query 'Jesus or Christ?' is a real distinction. He does not believe, however, that it is a necessary alternative. 'Jesus' represents one great body of theology, 'Christ' represents another. These two creeds, if we may call them so, are distinct in origin and for a time had an independent history. But the time came when, like two streams, they ran into one. It came in the lifetime of those who had seen Jesus in the flesh. And Dr. FLETCHER holds that it is possible for us to-day to receive them both. He holds that only in receiving them both do we receive Apostolic Christianity in completeness and in power.

---

But the titles are ill chosen. The 'Jesus'



stream is best known as belief in the Messiah. That is what Dr. FLETCHER means by the 'Dei Christus' of his title. The 'Christ' stream, which should be called the Logos stream, he represents by the other part of his title 'Dei Verbum.' Let us now therefore discard the misleading distinction suggested by the words 'Jesus' and 'Christ,' and let us speak of the Messiah and the Logos.

The Messianic belief was Jewish. That is well known, and no one has ever thrown doubt upon it. The Apostle Paul had it as a belief, therefore, while he was still an anti-Christian Pharisee. And he retained it after he became a Christian. What did it signify? To some it had a more material political significance than to others; but to all it was a conviction that the Creator of the ends of the earth would make Himself known sooner or later as the God of the Hebrew nation, and would punish the Gentiles who held them in subjection. Moreover, the belief was practically universal that when He did reveal Himself He would do so by a catastrophic act, which would be not less striking than the act by which He had overwhelmed the world in the days of Noah. And when this took place God's Messiah, the Christus Dei of the Latin language, would be there, to be established as a Prince over Israel.

Who was this Messiah? He was variously conceived, but always in some degree supernaturally, and always in some degree anthropically. He was a Son of Man. He existed ideally in the Divine mind from eternity, but He belonged actually to the time-order, to history. Moses, David, and (with reservations) the Persian kings were the models upon which the conception was built. But to these models were always added wisdom and power such as were never possessed by common men.

The Logos conception was Jewish also. It was not so exclusively Jewish as the Messianic idea. The Platonic and Stoic philosophy embraced it. But to Paul it was at least commended by the

Wisdom literature of the Old Testament, and especially by the apocryphal Book of Wisdom, with which Paul was, in Dr. FLETCHER's judgment, intimately acquainted. It is probable, he thinks, that before it took final shape in Paul's theology it had passed to him through the Alexandrian speculations which were under the influence of Plato and the Stoics, and through Philo; but its origin and authority for the Apostle was the Old Testament.

Now the Logos conception is wholly distinct from the Messianic idea. It carries us back to the Creation. The Logos is the 'image' or 'shadow' of God, and His instrument in the Creation of the world. The world was 'from' God and 'by' Christ. And being Creator, the Logos was also Preserver, and ever present in the world, the Light of every person that ever enters into it, and sometimes making His presence known in a dream of the night or a waking vision,

Well, the disciples of Jesus identified Him with the Messiah and they identified Him with the Logos. Dr. FLETCHER is not sure in what degree either identification was suggested by Jesus Himself. But he believes that Jesus at least accepted the identification both with the Messiah and with the Logos. The time came, and that within the lifetime of those who had seen Jesus in the flesh, when these two ideas were welded into one. The historic Man, anointed from heaven with the Divine Spirit and endued with Divine power, was amalgamated with the eternal Wisdom or Word, that Divine spiritual Life which was ever in touch with the world. Dr. FLETCHER seems to think that the synthesis was most probably due to the master mind of St. Paul.

This synthesis, we are frequently told, was a serious error, and we must separate the conceptions again. On the one hand we are invited by HARNACK and others to purge Christianity of the philosophical element which has entered into it along with the idea of the Logos, and so preserve



its value for Religion. On the other hand we are advised to drop the historical element. We are urged to give up the old method of thought which, as EUCKEN says, 'conceived of the Divine as being enclosed in a particular point of time.' We are asked to turn from our segregation of the one historic case and contemplate an incarnation in humanity of the Divine Logos, to recognize that the Church is Christ—an extension of His humanity—and its voice His voice.

Dr. FLETCHER does not believe that we require to give up either the Messiah or the Word. But he believes that it is no longer possible to retain either conception in the form in which it has come down to us. The Messianic idea must no longer include the mental picture of a human figure descending from the sky or of a meeting in the air. It must no longer demand a sudden end to the material world or to this planet. And the Logos doctrine must be cleansed of all theories of a pantheistic character, and all speculations which involve the notion that matter is inherently evil. We may then believe in a Christ of God, who comes and goes and will come again; and at the same time in a Word of God, who is ever present. We may believe, and rejoice in the belief, that that very Jesus who comes and goes is with us even unto the end of the world.

About a year ago there was published a life of John Henry Cardinal NEWMAN. It is a large book. Its two volumes contain thirteen hundred pages. Yet it is occupied almost entirely with NEWMAN's life after he became a Roman Catholic. Only seventy pages are given to that part of his life which he spent in the Church of England, though it is by far the most important part. No proper biography of NEWMAN as an Anglican has ever been written.

There are many Lives of Christ. We have just counted those in our own private library. They number eighty-one, yet only two or three of them

touch the life of Christ before He came into the world. They occupy themselves with His life on earth as if there were no other. Yet the heavenly life of Christ is longer far, and far more momentous, than the earthly life.

We do not know so many incidents of the life which Christ lived before He came into the world. But we know enough to enable us to write a consistent biography of His pre-earthly existence. The materials are supplied partly by Christ Himself and partly by His disciples. It is necessary first of all that we should see how it came about that the apostles thought of Him as living an intelligible and significant life before He came into the world.

They knew Him first as an ordinary man. Let us go to Nazareth, where He was brought up, and look in at the carpenter's shop.

In the shop of Nazareth  
Pungent cedar haunts the breath.  
'Tis a low Eastern room,  
Windowless, touched with gloom.  
Workman's bench and simple tools  
Line the walls. Chests and stools,  
Yoke of ox, and shaft of plow,  
Finished by the Carpenter,  
Lie about the pavement now.  
In the room the Craftsman stands,  
Stands and reaches out His hands.

One day He laid the tools aside. Word had reached Him that the Baptist was at Bethany beyond Jordan, calling upon the people to repent and be ready for the coming Kingdom of God. He laid the tools aside and shut the shop door, never again to open it. For this was not His work. The call had come to Him to enter upon the work He had been sent to do. What work was that? It was to seek and save the lost.

That evening, when the Carpenter swept out  
The fragrant shavings from the workshop floor,  
And placed the tools in order, and shut to  
And barred for the last time the humble door,



And going on His way to save the world,  
 Turned from the labourer's lot for evermore,  
 I wonder was He glad?

That morning, when the Carpenter walked forth  
 From Joseph's cottage, in the glimmering light,  
 And bade His holy mother long farewell;  
 And through the skies of dawn, all pearly  
 bright,  
 Saw glooming the dark shadow of a cross,  
 Yet seeing, set His feet towards Calvary's  
 height,  
 I wonder was He sad?

Ah! when the Carpenter went on His way  
 He thought not for Himself of good or ill.  
 His path was one through shop or thronging men  
 Craving His help, e'en to the cross-crowned  
 hill,  
 In toiling, healing, loving, suffering—all  
 His joy and life to do His Father's will,  
 And earth and heaven are glad.

He came to the Baptist at Bethany and was  
 baptized with the rest. Then, after a time of  
 moral and spiritual conflict, differing only in degree  
 from that which every man must pass through, He  
 invited a few men, mostly fishermen, to accompany  
 Him, and went through the towns and villages  
 preaching, the substance of His preaching being  
 almost identical with that of John the Baptist.  
 But His followers, and for that matter people who  
 did not become followers, soon discovered that  
 this was no common man.

It was the miracles He did that arrested their  
 attention first, and especially His power over  
 Nature. When He turned water into wine the  
 disciples were greatly impressed. The striking  
 words are used that He 'manifested forth his  
 glory; and his disciples believed on him.' And  
 when He stilled a storm on the Sea of Galilee the  
 people were astonished beyond measure, and said,  
 'Who in the world is this, that even the wind and  
 the sea obey him?'

But His preaching itself was quite unusual. His  
 word was with authority, the people said; and  
 they contrasted it in this respect with the manner  
 of their scribes. Probably what they meant was  
 that, whereas the scribes quoted others, Jesus  
 was Himself the authority for what He said. 'Ye  
 have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy  
 neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto  
 you, Love your enemies.' And although such  
 teaching was startling enough in its independence,  
 especially to a nation to whom independence was  
 the sign of charlatanry, we are told that the common  
 people heard Him gladly. For it was not merely  
 that He spoke with personal authority, He spoke  
 in such a way that even if they did not recognize  
 the obligation of the demands He made upon them,  
 they could not but feel His sincerity, perhaps also  
 the reach of His understanding and the moral  
 weight of His personality.

His personality made a great impression upon  
 them. It was not simply that He was sinless,  
 though that is marvellous enough. Sinlessness is  
 negative. What they saw was the wholeness of  
 His life and character. It was made up of  
 opposites. He was stern enough to drive the  
 traders out of the Temple and tender enough to  
 lift the infants into His arms. And the opposites  
 were all blended into a perfect whole, so that those  
 who knew Him became attached to Him, and those  
 who knew Him best were most deeply attached.  
 It was not the absence of the ordinary and other-  
 wise invariable human errors that they remarked;  
 it was the power He possessed of giving Himself  
 heartily to the self-sacrificing demands of a positive  
 and persistent love.

Then He claimed to be able to forgive sin. This  
 to the Jews was simply blasphemy. For, as they  
 said, and said truly enough, 'Who can forgive  
 sins, but God alone?' They said so truly enough.  
 We are with them in their sense of the im-  
 possibility of pardon coming from the hand of  
 any man. For sin, to be sin, is against God. The  
 cry is old, but every generation of sinful men takes



it up and says, 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.' Yet Jesus forgave sin, making no distinction between one sinner and another, unless it were that the greater sinner had the readier forgiveness. 'Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee'—and He gave him to understand that the woman who had come into the house in tears had found pardon already, though her sin might be reckoned at five hundred pence against Simon's fifty.

And it is on record that when the occasion called for it He deliberately claimed to be on an equality with God. This deliberate claim is most evident in the Fourth Gospel. But the claim itself is quite inseparable from the other three. He represented His judgment as invariably the judgment of God. 'I say unto you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other'; that is to say, accepted by God—this publican rather than the Pharisee. And when the lost was found, 'There shall be joy,' He said, 'in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons which need no repentance.'

Then came His death and resurrection. And after the resurrection, one of the disciples spoke the mind of them all, and said, 'My Lord and my God.' It was said quietly, and it was quietly accepted. 'Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.'

Now it was not easy for these men to say 'My Lord and my God.' It went against their most intimate ideas and all their most cherished beliefs. It was simply the result of their experience of Jesus. As one of them afterwards expressed it, they declared what they had seen and heard and their hands had handled. For God was a remote being, and the tendency of Jewish thought at the time was to push Him ever further away. They had begun, it is believed, to shrink from the use of

the personal name Yahweh and to use a paraphrase instead. In the 8th Psalm there is an interesting phrase referring to the greatness of man. The Psalmist says, 'Thou hast made him but little lower than God.' Later Jews could not tolerate God and man being brought so close together, and they changed the expression into 'a little lower than the angels.'

But to call Jesus God not only withdrew the distance that separated God from man, it also went against the letter of the Law, and that in its first and most fundamental particular. 'Hear, O Israel, Yahweh, thy God, Yahweh is one.' The disciples of Jesus could not fail to see that if Jesus was God, and there was also God the Father, of whom He spoke so frequently, then if there were not more gods than one, at least in the Godhead there was more than one Person. And to this day that is the stone of stumbling with the children of Abraham.

We may safely say that when the disciples of Jesus said 'My Lord and my God' they were driven to it by the demands of their experience. But, having said it, they began to think what it involved. They had new material for their thoughts to work upon; evidently also new faculties to work with. And among other things they came to understand that Jesus had a life previous to His coming into the world.

As we approach this life after them, let us remember that it is the life of the very person who left the carpenter's shop in Nazareth and came to John's baptism. Then—

Could I fear such a hand  
Stretched toward me? Misunderstand  
Or mistrust? Doubt that He  
Meets me in full sympathy?  
Carpenter! hard like Thine  
Is this hand—this of mine:  
I reach out, gripping Thee,  
Son of man, close to me,  
Close and fast, fearlessly.



# The Interpretation of Religious Experience.<sup>1</sup>

By PRINCIPAL THE REV. JAMES IVERACH, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE public philosophical career of Professor Watson dates from the publication of his first work, *Kant and his English Critics*. This was published in 1881. Ever since that time he has been busy and has written many works which have taken a high place in the literature of philosophy. He has won special eminence as an interpreter of Kant. He has brought Kant within the reach of English students, first by his admirable work *The Philosophy of Kant as contained in Extracts from his own Writings*, and second by the work *The Philosophy of Kant Explained*. These are works of abiding merit. Though one sometimes feels that Professor Watson interprets Kant from the standpoint of Hegel, and sometimes makes Kant speak from a point of view that he never reached, yet on the whole one obtains from the works of our author help towards the understanding of Kant as regards his own system, and towards the understanding of his place in the evolution of philosophic thought. As to his own proper contribution towards philosophy, the most significant of his works until now is *The Philosophical Basis of Religion*, which in a measure is an anticipation of the Gifford Lectures. He has written other works also, notably his contributions to Ethics and to the history of philosophy, and numerous articles in philosophical journals. Thus, when he was appointed Gifford Lecturer by his Alma Mater, he had a high position as a philosophical writer, and his lectures were awaited with expectation. As for ourselves, we say at the outset that we have been diligent in our study of his works from the beginning, and they lie in array before us. We admire his vigorous writing, his wide knowledge of the history of philosophy, his effective advocacy of idealism, and his vigorous criticism of Hedonistic theories. Agreement on many points we felt as we read his works, but whether we agreed or disagreed we always felt that we lay under a heavy obligation to his clear thinking and his vigorous

presentation of his own view. Where we began to part company was when we read his work on the *Philosophical Basis of Religion*, but even there and then our dissent was modified by the reflexion that he was writing, not on religion as a whole, but only on the philosophical bases of it.

It was possible to supplement his view by the insertion of factors and phenomena which he had apparently forgotten. Nor did the account of religious experience given in that work appear to us adequate or sufficient. So we waited with patience for the appearance of his Gifford Lectures. We hailed with gladness the title of the Lectures. It is a great title, 'The Interpretation of Religious Experience.' It covers the whole ground. It is no longer the philosophical basis of religion that we have to study, it is the whole field of religious experience. We do not find, however, any advance on the former work. He has still the same inadequate view of religion, the same tendency to regard it as the other side of philosophy. This attitude is indeed common to all idealists, and it affects the whole estimate of religion formed by them. Philosophically one finds that the one is as necessary to God as God is to the world. We find also that God is nothing for Himself, that the ultimate of thought is the whole, and that God, man, and the world are only aspects of the whole. Dr. Watson has his own peculiarities of statement and of exposition, but the underlying principle of exposition is that common to idealism.

We cannot withhold our admiration and appreciation of the ability of the work, of its cogent reasoning, of its acute dialectic power, of its extensive knowledge, and of its incisive criticism of opposing systems. It is a notable production from every point of view. Whether we have regard to the historical or to the constructive part, it is equally worthy of admiration. Yet it must be said that the historical part is more a history of philosophy than a history of the interpretation of religious experience. He takes a wide survey of the history of thought in matters which certainly border on religion, yet the survey is conditioned by the theory of religion which he has formed.

<sup>1</sup> *The Interpretation of Religious Experience*. The Gifford Lectures, delivered in the University of Glasgow in the years 1910-12, by John Watson, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons; 2 vols., 10s. 6d. each.



It is a selection from the history of human endeavour to understand himself, the universe, and God, but the principle of selection is drawn from the speculative scheme brought to it by Dr. Watson. Nor do we find that it is adequate to the purpose set forth in the title of the book, except on the supposition of the truth of Dr. Watson's constructive view of religion. We do not regard his account of the Hebrew, or of the origin and character of the Christian religion, as true or adequate. And there are names in the history of religion of no slight importance which do not appear in his historical survey. The historical part is of great value as a contribution to the history of philosophy, it is of less importance as a contribution towards the interpretation of religious experience.

As to the constructive part, we are in the same divided state of mind, and feel difficulties like to those present to us as we studied the historical part. We have learned a great deal from him as we read his lectures. We are at one with him in his criticism of all forms of materialism, and we feel that the principle of his criticism is not dependent on our acceptance of his absolutism. No doubt he contends for a concrete absolute. The concluding sentences of the second volume may be quoted. 'No doubt if we conceive the ultimate principle as one that abolishes all the self-activity or freedom of finite beings, the result must be, not indeed a mechanical conception of things, but an Absolute of which nothing definite can be predicated. But such an Absolute is at the opposite pole from the Absolute for which I have been contending. The former excludes, while the latter includes, all differences. The one denies that our intelligence can define the ultimate nature of reality, the other declares that in spirit or self-consciousness we reach the idea that makes all others intelligible: the first denies the self-activity of man, while our view maintains that without self-activity man could not exist at all. It thus seems to me that with the removal of these misconceptions, it becomes obvious that the religious interests of man can be preserved only by a theology which affirms that all forms of being are manifestations of a single spiritual principle in identification with which the true life of man consists. Living in this faith the future of the race is secured. Religion is the spirit which must more and more subdue all things to itself, inform-

ing science and art, and realizing itself in the higher organization of the family, the civic community, the state, and ultimately the world, and gradually filling the mind and heart of every individual with the love of God and the enthusiasm of humanity.' It is a consummation devoutly to be wished, and we are glad that the author was able to finish his courses of lectures with such a hopeful view. We feel that on his system the hope is not likely to be realized.

Apart from its reference to religious experience, we have some difficulties in accepting the idealist account and interpretation of experience in general. Our main difficulty is that when one accepts the principle of self-consciousness as the ultimate and the highest principle of explanation that can be used, how can it be used in order to get the self? Granted that the unity in distinction of subject is fundamental, and that all experience, as we know it, is under that form, how do we get beyond the self, and reach other selves, or reach objectivity at all? This is the difficulty which has beset all attempts to explain the universe on the principle of self-consciousness. The whole of the idealistic scheme of things is a splendid achievement from the point of view of one self. The great achievement of Hegel is splendid as an account of the process in which the self, passing away from indistinct experience, on to more complete articulation of its experience into definite principles, at length arrives at complete self-consciousness, and to complete self-mastery. But in that account it is assumed that this account of the evolution of self-consciousness is also a complete account of the evolution of the universe. The analysis of self-consciousness easily led to a victory over the old dualism of mind and matter, and over all other dualisms of a similar order. But in that victory it was brought face to face with a new dualism, namely, that between one self and another self, or between self and society. How does it surmount that new dualism? Usually we are led away from the story of the evolution by which the self reaches complete self-consciousness to a study of the means whereby the self is able to realize itself. The ground is shifted, and we obtain a discussion of society, of the origin of the individual within society, of the ways in which society equips its children for the warfare of life, —in art, science, philosophy, language, and so forth—and we are told that the individual can



realize himself only in society. All this is very true and very trite, but to what purpose are we told all these truisms? For one thing it helps to obscure the issue. The issue is, How can a history of the evolution of the self, under the rubric, subject-object, help us to unlock the mystery of the universe? It does not help us to have a picture of the achievement of many selves working in harmony, and a description of the work of what is called the 'objective spirit' if we are not shown the bearing of it on the evolution of self-consciousness as the key to the mystery of the universe. Can the passage from the individual self with which idealism begins to the multitude of selves which the second line of thought indicated above be harmoniously taken? Briefly taken, idealism says, subject and object are correlative, every object implies a subject, and *vice versa*; therefore the universe considered as object implies a subject, and a subject great enough to be equal to its mighty task. But there are many steps between, and these are neither explicitly taken nor lucidly explained. We submit that it is not harmonious thinking to start with the one self, and then to pass suddenly to the co-operation of many selves, without an examination of the process of how the experience and the method of the one self, which, as it is all that has been examined, can become the common experience of the many selves which is presupposed in art, science, and so on, and shown to have been operative in the evolution of the one self. The antithesis of the self and society has only been avoided, this dualism remains. The master himself brings us face to face with this antithesis, and he leaves us there. 'The idea of a unit or a One is, to begin with, something wholly abstract: these units get a still deeper meaning when they are expressed in terms of Spirit, since they are characterised as persons. Personality is something which is essentially based on freedom; freedom is its first, deepest, most inward form, but also its most abstract form as the freedom which proclaims its presence in the subject by saying, I am a person, I exist for myself. This is isolation pure and simple, a condition of pure reserve.

'When therefore these differences are defined thus, and each is taken as a unit, or in fact as a person, owing to the infinite form according to which each moment is regarded as a subject, the difficulty of satisfying the demand of the Idea that

these differences should be regarded as differences which are not different, but are purely one, and that this difference should be abolished, appears to be still more insurmountable.

'Two cannot be one: each person has a rigid, reserved, independent, self-centred existence. Logic shows that the category of the unit is a poor category, a wholly abstract unit. But when we are dealing with personality, the contradiction seems to be pushed so far as to be incapable of any solution: still the solution is contained in the fact that there is only one person, and this threefold personality which is posited merely as a vanishing moment, expresses the truth that the antithesis is an absolute one, and is not to be taken as an inferior antithesis, and that it is just exactly when it has got to this point it abolishes itself. It is, in short, the nature or character of what we mean by person or subject to abolish its isolation, its separateness.

'Morality, love, just mean the giving up of particularity, or of the particular personality, and its extension to universality; and so, too, is it with the family and friendship, for there you have the identity of the one with the other. Inasmuch as I act rightly towards another, I consider him as identical with myself. In friendship and love I give up my abstract personality, and in this way win it back as concrete personality. It is just this winning back of personality by the act of absorption, by the being absorbed into the other, which constitutes the true nature of personality' (Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion*, vol. iii. pp. 24-25).

Such is the statement of the dualism between the individual and society as it presented itself to Hegel, and such is his way out of the difficulty. It appears to us that he has not overcome the difficulty; he has evaded it. What his argument would require, nay what his system requires, is to discover a consciousness of the community to which love, morality, and so on, would be present, and to confront this object with a subject equal to the strain. He says nothing of this consciousness save in vague and metaphorical terms. Inasmuch as I act rightly towards another, I consider him identical with myself. So be it; but the argument requires that the two should now have common consciousness, and the separate consciousness ought to be abolished. There is thus this great hiatus in the ascent from self-consciousness, as it exists in the individual subject we know, upwards to that absolute self-consciousness which



is subject to the universe as object. It would seem that the idealistic philosophy ought to do its work over again.

As it is with the disciples' master, so it is with his disciples. They all ignore this difficulty. Hegel says in his *Logic* (Sect. 48, Wallace's translation), 'Every actual thing involves a co-existence of opposed elements. Consequently to know, or, in other words, to comprehend an object, is equivalent to being conscious of it as a concrete unity of opposed determinations.' It is profoundly true, as far as regards the world with which we are in interaction; for any object in the world, and the world as a whole consists of elements which exist only as they are related, all these antinomies have been overcome by thought, and the knowing self has been able to hold the object together, the opposition notwithstanding. But there is one field of operation of the conscious mind in which it finds itself under different conditions altogether. We have to think of a different kind of unity. There is an experience alongside my experience into which I cannot penetrate. That self has its own experience, of which by certain signs I may be aware; but that other self thinks its own thoughts, enjoys its own life, and, while we have a consciousness of common aims, hopes, and fears, yet we have not a common consciousness. But each subject is a universal intelligence. Well, that makes the idealistic synthesis all the harder to understand. Dr. Watson's solution of the antinomy, a solution which is often expressed in these lectures, is as follows: 'Self-conscious individuality is the world of spiritual life, which assumes the form of the moral life and the order of society. Freedom is necessarily involved in morality. To be free is not to lead an isolated life, but a life which is most perfectly identified with the ends that reason prescribes. A community of self-conscious individuals, all recognising that each must be a self, and that what is demanded of one is demanded of all under the same conditions, is freedom, because no subject can be free that does not recognise the claims of every subject as equal to his own, and his own as equal to the claims of others. The moral life is thus essentially a social life. Action which proceeds from such a regard for oneself as is inconsistent with due regard for others, is not moral. Thus there is no opposition between egoism and altruism, such as is sometimes affirmed. To realise myself I must

attain that which is best for me: but that which is best for me is that which is best for all other selves as well. Thus morality involves the transcendence of immediate impulse, and the setting up of laws that are permanent and universal, existing as it does only through the realisation in the individual of universal self-consciousness.' We read this paragraph, as we have read much in these volumes, without dissent. We agree with it all, and in fact think highly of it. But the leap upward and forward, in the last sentence, took our breath away. Yet we ought to have expected it, from many passages in the lectures. But nowhere have we found a sufficient justification of the statement that morality exists 'only through the realisation in the individual of universal self-consciousness.' The argument of the paragraph would only justify the assertion that a community of self-conscious individuals should itself be self-conscious. Indeed, Hegel goes often far on the way towards this assertion, and his doctrine of the State seems to involve it. Dr. Watson's argument would seem to need it as well, as a step on the upward path towards a universal self-consciousness. For all that he sets forth in the foregoing paragraph can be maintained without that which is added in the concluding sentence. The passage from the individual self to a multitude of selves cannot be taken by the bridge set up by Hegel, and supported in his own way by Dr. Watson. For though the principle of self-consciousness is the highest category we can use, it is impossible by its exclusive use to rise higher than the self. So idealists, consciously or unconsciously, take refuge in considerations similar to those contained in the passage quoted from Hegel, and in the paragraph from Dr. Watson. It seems to be illegitimate without discussion to extend the principle of self-consciousness which undoubtedly holds together the elements of self and not-self in unity to the inclusion of self and other selves in a similar unity. Experience is possible because the self is the ground of all experience. But the opposition of subject and object takes on another colour when the opposition is between one self and another. Here we observe that Hegel and Dr. Watson bring in the impersonal as a bond of unity. But when they do so they have ceased to use the formula of self-consciousness.

Thus we are not able to follow the absolute idealists in their swift ascent to the universal self-



consciousness. And we do not regret it much, because the universal self-consciousness is only a poor and barren category for that which men call God. Even Philosophy as the ultimate interpretation of experience cannot long dwell in contentment with it, and religion must have something greater far than this. Had we space we would try to point out how much of religious experience finds no place in this interpretation of it. Nor do we find that Dr. Watson is always fair in his criticism of other interpretations. We have no interest in defending Deism, nor any other of the *isms* which are criticised by Dr. Watson. We find that Theism is not touched by any of his criticisms. But even his criticism of Deism is somewhat inept, and certainly his criticism of the doctrine of creation is open to criticism. The difficulty involved connected with this view is insuperable. In the first place, it involves the contradiction that 'God is infinite before the creation of the world, and is no more than infinite after its creation.' At first we put this down as a philosophical ineptitude. But it occurs again and again in the course of these discussions. We do not know what the author means when he applies quantitative measures to God, or how he can apply such measures to spirit. But quantitative measurements can apply only to material things, and cannot be applied at all to Spirit. If God is Spirit, and Dr. Watson says so, His infinitude is there irrespective of the world, and the existence of the world has no relation to His infinitude, unless we hold that matter limits spirit, as matter limits matter. We are not afraid to defend on philosophical grounds the sublime saying, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'

We intended to notice the way in which Dr. Watson deals with the problem of evil, and we had some notes of his treatment of the antinomy of necessity and freedom. But on these we cannot enter. We say this only, that the problem of evil is a problem for all kinds of theology and of philosophy. It does not help a reader when he finds Dr. Watson magnifying the problem when he is criticising Deism, and minimising it when he sets forth his own system. In the one case it is absolutely destructive of the view that a just and good God created the world, on the other hand it is only a stage in the evolution of good. Has it occurred to Dr. Watson that a holy and just God

could create a world which should grow, through a process of evolution, towards such an end as would finally justify the process? What if the unity of Creator and created is, not a starting-point, but a goal? Theism is as evolutionary as Idealism is. Says Professor A. E. Taylor (*Review of Theology and Philosophy*, viii. 56):

'I urge, then, that the sound contention that a world in which we can co-operate with one another and with nature must be a systematic unity of itself tells us nothing as to the nature of the constituents of that world, or of the precise way in which they are wrought into unity. To know anything of that you must go to living experience and see how unity manifests itself there.' So far as the bare logical principle takes you, a world of absolutely genuine individuals, even a world consisting exclusively of persons, united by community of aim and purpose and by their relation to a common personal Creator, satisfies it just as well as a world which is thoroughly mechanical in its structure, and consists of complex predicates of a single subject.' We, too, believe in a rational world. We believe that the world is systematic, but we also believe that the principles of these Lectures fail in doing justice to this contention.

We look at one more passage of the Lectures as we close. 'The idea of humanity is not a mere abstract conception, formed by elimination of the differences of one man from another, but that of a concrete spiritual being, containing all the perfections of which individual men are capable. Such a conception has been elaborated by the Church in the Person of Christ, and in devotion and love for this concrete realisation of the ideal may be found the living principle by which the evil of human nature can be transcended. In this divine figure is gathered up and concentrated that comprehensive sympathy and love for all men, which is fitted to awaken a corresponding sympathy and love. Here we have the combination of absolute love and of absolute righteousness. When the individual man is possessed by the spirit of which Christ is the perfect embodiment, he is lifted above himself and made one with God. The Christ which operates in and through the spirit of individuals is God himself, present now as he has ever been, in the souls of all men, revealing himself in all that makes for the perfect life. Christ after the flesh, the historic person, has passed away, but the Christ of the spirit remains for ever,



for he is one with the ever-growing life of humanity which consists in the progressive conquest of evil by the living power of goodness.' If that is all that one can say of Christ, then from that point of view the interpretation of Christian religious experience is impossible. Communion with Christ as a living Person is a fact of religious experience; attested by testimony in all the Christian ages. Christ after the flesh, he says, has passed away. Has He? We know that from the time of Strauss and Baur it has become a commonplace of some kinds of criticism that it was through the Messianic conception that Christianity attained to concreteness and universality. Our contention, on the contrary, is that it is through the real historic figure depicted in the Gospels that Christianity became a religion for humanity. There were many forms of Messiahisms in the first century, but these have now only an antiquarian interest. That form of Messiahism which we call Christianity has become perpetual just because at the heart of it is the Man of Nazareth, that gracious thorn-crowned figure who lived and died for men. The abstract Christ of the paragraph would be powerless to effect the ends which Dr. Watson describes so sympathetically. We need the human Christ, who

died and rose again, who lives still, and with whom men can hold communion to-day. He lives and works to-day, and the power of Christianity lies just in this that men can truly say and realize that Christ is a person who can help, save, and make men blessed to-day.

The process of turning historic facts and persons into ideas began very early in the Christian Church. One finds the process described and repudiated in the First Epistle of John. We find it in full swing amid the Gnostics; we find it through the ages, and we find it again in full bloom in the lectures of Dr. Watson. But whenever this tendency has obtained predominance in the Church, then the Church's aggressive mission has almost ceased. It was only when men returned to the New Testament, and took the Jesus of the Gospels seriously, that the Church could perform her gracious healing work. For after all has been said ideas are only Ghosts that pass athwart us in their vapour, and leave us untouched and cold. So we cannot accept the idealistic Christ presented to us by Dr. Watson. We think we can justify the reality of Christ on grounds of reason, and certainly we need Him if we are to have an adequate explanation of our religious experience.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF ACTS.

#### ACTS x. 34, 35.

And Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.

#### I.

1. THE place in which the remarkable vision (vv.<sup>10-15</sup>) appeared to St. Peter was peculiarly adapted for its purpose. The outward circumstances most appropriately clothed and expressed the inner meaning of the vision. The harbour of Joppa was the only one on the sea-board of Palestine—the only point of contact between the exclusive Jews and the outlying nations. The difficulty of going in and out—owing to its wild rocks and stormy waters—symbolized, as it were,

the difficulties of creed and race which lay in the way of the extension of the Divine kingdom. It was by the way of Joppa that the Gentiles of Syria landed the cedar and the pine-wood which Solomon employed in building the temple of the Lord at Jerusalem. It was by the way of Joppa that similar materials were conveyed, by permission of the Gentile Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the second temple under Zerubbabel. It was by the way of Joppa that Jonah went to preach salvation to the Gentile Ninevites. And now it was by the way of Joppa that the Jews were appointed to convey to the Gentiles the glorious gospel of Him who was typified by the temple, who had tabernacled with men, and by His life and death had united in bonds of brotherly love the estranged nations which He had made of one blood. In this port-



town many sailors, traders, and artizans of other nations resided, some of whom, by becoming proselytes to the Jewish faith, formed the link connecting the Jews with the Gentiles, the law of Moses with the gospel, the synagogue with the Church.

2. The heavenly vision and message took shape from the natural condition of the apostle at the time. He had been fasting and praying for several hours, and was in consequence worn out with fatigue and faint with hunger. The higher want of his spirit was therefore supplied by a vision suggested by the want of his lower nature. The Divine light which, breaking through the misty atmosphere of traditional notions, was about to rise upon his soul displayed itself, as Neander says, in the mirror of sensuous images proceeding from the hunger of his body. Probably, too, the form of the vision—the mould in which it was cast—was determined by the circumstances in which he was placed. He was living in the house of Simon the *tanner*, a man whose occupation was regarded by the stricter Jews as unclean. The Levitical law forbade contact with death in any shape lest defilement should be contracted; but here was a man whose calling exposed him to constant contamination. He prepared the skins of animals—clean and unclean without distinction, we may suppose, if they suited his purpose.

The trade in which St. Peter's host was engaged may have suggested the great sheet let down from heaven, knit at the four corners, filled with all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air; just as the shepherd's ordinary watch-fire, and the natural thorny growth of the desert formed the outward vehicle by which God revealed Himself to Moses. The fact that he was the guest of such a man indicated that he had lost much of his old Pharisaic strictness—that the events of Pentecost, the conversion of the Samaritans, and, more than all, the new element in the teaching of Stephen sealed by his death of martyrdom, had somewhat enlarged his heart, and dispelled some of the most bitter of his Jewish prejudices. The house of Simon the tanner at Joppa was not only physically, but morally a half-way house between Jerusalem and Cæsarea, between the temple of the Jews and the house of Cornelius the Roman centurion. And yet, notwithstanding the inconsistency of his conduct in dwelling in the house

of an unclean person, the Jewish instincts of St. Peter recoiled with abhorrence from the vision which presented in such a palpable shape before him what he had been taught and accustomed to avoid carefully as a source of moral infection.

It is Christianity alone which, as the religion of humanity, as the religion of no caste, of no chosen people, has taught us to study the history of mankind, as our own, to discover the traces of a divine wisdom and love in the development of all the races of the world, and to recognize, if possible, even in the lowest and crudest forms of religious belief, not the work of the devil, but something that indicates a divine guidance, something that makes us perceive, with St. Peter, 'that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.'<sup>1</sup>

## II.

1. Cornelius was a centurion. He was in command of a company of Italian soldiers, and was stationed at Cæsarea, a city situated on the Palestine coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and built by Herod the Great. Judging by the name he bore, which takes us back to the name of some of the most illustrious families of Rome, the centurion himself was an Italian. He was evidently an intelligent, sober-minded man, calm in his disposition, serious in his purpose, and of a singularly deep religious nature. Like others of the worthy remnant of his morally decaying nation who had not followed the leaders of opinion into a wholly despairing mood or a scornful indifference to Divine things, he hungered in his inmost soul for God, and in virtue of this feeling his heart responded warmly to the spiritual ideas and habits of the people who were about him. He came to be known as a man of marked piety and great reverence, as one who ordered his house in godliness, who had an open hand for the poor, and who kept his heart in communion with the Father through prayer. These are the qualities and characteristics ascribed to him, and this is the beautiful language in which the Scriptures have immortalized his memory: 'A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always.'

2. Cornelius was keeping the stated hour of prayer, three o'clock in the afternoon, according to the Jewish custom. He was one of those who are always praying and *therefore* observe stated

<sup>1</sup> Max Müller, *Science of Religion*, 29.



times of prayer. It is only people who are always praying to whom stated hours of prayer seem essential and fruitful. And, while he was praying, there came to him a vision, such as is not unknown to-day to those who have pressed through, in continuous supplication, into the secret shrine of prayer. There seemed to be a man standing before him, in shining garments, who told him that his prayers and his almsgiving had been accepted by God; and now, if he wished for further light, he should send to Joppā, and fetch Peter from the house of one Simon the tanner.

### III.

1. Turn back for a moment to Peter. Not all at once did he learn his lesson. Few men ever do. It takes time to come into the mastery, and still more to yield to the mastery, of conceptions which are new and revolutionary. He was 'perplexed.' The vision was a mystery to him, and the secret or intent of his strange experience he could not quite divine. But he was not long to remain in doubt and confusion of mind. For thirty-five miles down the coast, at Cæsarea, God, whose ways are not our ways, had been working, as we have already seen, on another heart and getting it ready, not only to receive a great and crowning blessing, but to interpret to this bewildered apostle the meaning and purpose of what he had seen. As a result of this preparation which had been going on at Cæsarea, and while Peter was still agonizing over the problem of his vision, three men stood at the gate of the tanner's house and asked for the guest whom he was entertaining. They had come from Cornelius.

2. The following morning Peter returned with them to Cæsarea, taking with him a number, six in all, of Jewish brethren. They were all day travelling, and passed the night, Lumby thinks, at Apollonia. The next day they arrived at Cæsarea, and entered the house of Cornelius, who had gathered his friends and household servants together to hear the whole counsel of God. What a congregation! They were in sympathy with the Word; and they were there to obey the Word. They had not come together to be entertained, neither had they come together as critics, but as men anxious to know the truth and to obey it. Each rehearsed his story. Peter reminded those present of the unlawfulness—this was under current

interpretation of the Levitical law—of what he had done in coming to them and entering into these relations with them; but instructed by his vision, and reassured and urged on by the Spirit, he was there 'without gainsaying,' so he declared, to learn what was desired of him. Speaking for himself and the others, Cornelius said, 'We are all here present in the sight of God, to hear all things that have been commanded thee of the Lord.'

3. There is one conclusion, at any rate, which we cannot but draw from this meeting. It is a lesson of *the need and value of prayer*. These two praying men met. I have all sympathy with unbelievers, but no sympathy with unbelievers who do not pray. You need no dogma to teach you to pray; it is part of the very instinct of the human heart; it is an impulse which you have to repress, not to create. If, being an unbeliever, you do not pray, you are never likely to know. Cornelius, not knowing, still prayed, and therefore knew. There are many among us to-day, who have no more religion than Cornelius had. They say, 'We know, or we believe in, God; we feel that that is a truth of the reason. We know and we believe in righteousness; we know that that is a truth of the conscience. And yet, we do not believe in Christ, we do not accept the great revelation of God.' No, I will not quarrel with you, if you do not accept that revelation as yet; always provided that, believing in God, as you say you do, you are continually praying to Him for light; and believing in righteousness, as you say you do, you are living the life of purity and truth. We will make no quarrel with the unbeliever who prays, who knows what is right, and therefore does it. As certainly as the sun rises in the heavens, to such a man Christ will rise, with healing in His wings; and He will be the solution of all the difficulties, as He was to Cornelius, the Roman centurion. And, equally, those of us who believe in Christ, like Peter, and who wish that we might serve Him and bring other souls to Him—we must pray, and pray for them. We cannot do much, alone. We do not know which men to speak to. We do not know which is the opportunity; and when the opportunity comes, we do not know what to say. Prayerless men make a constant bungle of religious talk. No one should talk religion who is not always talking to God, and is not always hearing Him speak. Pray God



will teach you whom to seek and what to say. For the most part, we poor human beings live deep down in the dark cells of human life, and insuperable barriers are between us which we cannot pierce, so that we cannot touch our brother, or be touched by him. But God says, 'Mount up on the wings of prayer, get up into the higher atmosphere.' There, in the higher air, we meet with one another, and our hearts are opened to one another, and we can speak of the things that touch us deeply, and we can win our brother to God.<sup>1</sup>

## IV.

It was just as characteristic of St. Peter to be slow in finding out new principles, and tenacious in holding by old prejudices, where it was a question of mind and will, as it was for him to be hasty and impulsive in action where the affections were called in question. It is difficult for us to estimate how much it had cost him to break through his ceremonial pride and accompany the messengers of Cornelius; so much so that he was even unable to lay it aside without mention after entering the house of the centurion. But, to whatever extent Peter had suffered on the journey and before, through laying aside his pride, he must have felt some compensation when he found the reception which awaited him. 'Thou hast well done that thou art come,' said Cornelius, 'now, therefore, we are all here present in the sight of God, to hear all things that have been commanded of thee of the Lord.' No preacher could desire more favourable circumstances for preaching a sermon.

Then Peter opened his mouth and gave unhesitating utterance to the large and gracious thought into which he had been led. 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.'<sup>2</sup>

1. *God is no respecter of persons.* A little while ago he was saying, 'Not so, Lord.' Nothing common or unclean must pass his lips. He could share in no intimacy of association, and no free and fraternal mingling, with pagans. Now he was avowing it as a fresh 'perception' or discovery, and by implication a fact to be recognized in all intercourse with all races and in all labours for the salvation of souls, and the extension of the

Kingdom of Christ, that God has an open heart and an open hand for the people of all nations, and that no man, speaking in the name of the Father and of the Son and under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, may venture to call any other man common or unclean. This broad principle which St. Peter was led to enunciate at Cæsarea, is one of the fundamental principles of St. Paul's teaching. His position in the matter throughout was impregnable and unswerving. If the Gentile Christians submitted to the condition of circumcision, they not only threw away their natural freedom, but they embraced Salvation on a false basis, they put the Law before the Gospel, and entered upon membership in the Church through the gate in the Synagogue, not through faith in the free gift in Christ Jesus. Thus St. Paul saw that a universal principle was being assailed; not for the Gentile only, but for the Jew, and for all men, Christ has superseded the Law. For the Jew, then, it was not circumcision that constituted his right to membership in the Church, nor on the other hand was it a barrier to him, for he, being born under the law, had come naturally under the ordinances of the law. The case of the Gentile was not so, if he willingly put himself under the law, he bound himself to fulfil the whole ritual of the law—a condition amounting almost to a natural impossibility, and certainly leading to insincerity.

St. Paul's views on this subject are clearly and forcefully stated in his letter to the Galatians, who had also been perverted by this strange doctrine. Here he vindicates the doctrine which he has taught them before, which he 'received not from man, but through revelation of Jesus Christ.' 'Though we,' he says, 'or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema.' St. Peter himself had been partially carried away by this Judaizing influence. St. Paul's revelation was clearer than that of the elder apostle's; he was able by an unanswerable argument to convince St. Peter that he was acting inconsistently (Gal 2<sup>14</sup>)—an argument that appealed so strongly to St. Peter that he put it forth again, with his own embellishment, to convince the Jerusalem Council: 'Why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?' (Ac 15<sup>11</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> R. F. Horton.<sup>2</sup> F. A. Noble.



There is an ancient Jewish story repeated by Dean Stanley in *The Jewish Church* (where its origin and transmission are dealt with in a footnote)—which finely illustrates the impartiality of God.

'When Abraham sat at his tent door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers, he espied an old man stooping and leaning upon his staff, weary with age and travel, coming towards him, who was an hundred years of age. He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down, but observing that the old man ate and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, asked why he did not worship the God of Heaven? The old man told him that he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other God; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to him and asked him where the stranger was; he replied, "I thrust him away, because he did not worship Thee." God answered, "I have suffered him these hundred years, though he dishonoured Me: and couldst thou not endure him for one night, when he gave thee no trouble?" Upon this, saith the story, Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction. Go and do thou likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham.'<sup>1</sup>

2. The Church does not yet in all respects live up to the great principle which St. Peter enunciated in his address to the household of Cornelius, but the sublime truth remains and will remain for ever that God is no respecter of persons, and that while all need to come to Him, all may come to Him and have share in the peace and glory of the everlasting inheritance.

The heavenly vision which appeared to St. Peter condemns the ceremonial distinctions which Christians still keep up. We break up life into fragments, and assign this part to the world, and that to God. We draw a line of demarcation between the secular and the sacred, as distinct as the line of verdure and the line of desert that run side by side, but never intermingle, all along the valley of the Nile. Such a division savours more of Pharisaism than of Christianity. Our Lord, by taking our nature and living our life, made them potentially divine. Ever since He broke the bread of common life and walked our earth, He made every meal a sacrament and every spot holy ground. As the body is one,

so also is the Christian life. Physical health is the harmonious action of every member according to its natural law; and religion is the true health of our whole being—the sanctification of body, soul, and spirit. Religion is the consecration of everything to God—of the whole of life—its eating and drinking as well as its fasting, its working as well as its praying, its joys as well as its sorrows, its pleasures as well as its duties, its week-days as well as its Sundays. It alone gives to man the use of his whole being and of the universe around him, and shows to him that 'The true human completeness lies, not in the proscription of any of the elements of his being, but in their proper exercise, and in the right blending of the whole.'<sup>2</sup>

For religion all men are equal, as all pennies are equal, because the only value any of them have is that they bear the image of the King. Piety produces greatness, precisely because piety in itself is quite indifferent to greatness. The strength of Cromwell was that he cared for religion; but the strength of religion was that it did not care for Cromwell—did not care for him, that is, any more than for anybody else. It has often been said, very truly, that it is religion which makes the ordinary man feel extraordinary; but it is an equally important truth that it is religion which makes the extraordinary man feel ordinary.<sup>3</sup>

A little while ago I read an account of what happened to Pastor Funcke of Bremen, who is well known in Germany. He went to see a working-man, whom he describes as a tall, strong man, with a red beard, living in a miserable little place, up a flight of rickety stairs. The man would not listen to him at all, but flew into a passion, saying, 'I don't want to hear anything about your God. I don't believe there is a God.' Then, clenching his fist, he said, '*This* is my god!' and bringing it down on the table with a thump, he added, 'If ever I find you on these premises again, I will put my god into your face!' The pastor went away, but a few days later hearing that the man was out of employment, he busied himself in finding a situation for him. By and by the man heard of this. He went to him and said, 'Is it true, sir, that you took the trouble to find me this employment?' 'Why, yes, it is true.' 'Well,' he said; '*all* Christians are not hypocrites!' That was to him a discovery, it seems. He invited the pastor to his house, and listened to him. 'And now,' says Mr. Funcke, 'he, his wife, and children are amongst the best of my church members, and theirs is one of the happiest homes in the parish.'<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stanley's *Jewish Church*, i. 18.

<sup>2</sup> H. Macmillan, *The Garden and the City*, 322.

<sup>3</sup> G. K. Chesterton.

<sup>4</sup> Theodor Monod.



# The Danger of Mares' Nests in Theology.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

## II.

1. WE have seen that the Hegelian version of Christian theology is a mare's nest. But philosophy, especially idealist philosophy, is not the latest intellectual fashion. It is psychology that is considered up-to-date; for it is expected to give us sure knowledge and not vain speculation. There can be no doubt of the value of psychology, the scientific study of the mental processes; and what follows is not in any way intended to discredit psychology within its own proper province. Neither need it be disputed that we can learn a great deal about the nature and the development of religion in the human subject by the application of the psychological method. The ultimate problems of the origin, the value, and the validity of religion, however, so involve the reference to the divine object, that psychology by itself is incapable of answering them; and there is still room for a philosophy of religion alongside of a psychology. In the solution of the problems of religious education and 'the cure of souls' psychology is likely to be more and more a potent factor. In the interpretation of the Scriptures the dogmatic has given place to the historical and the critical treatment; this needs to be supplemented explicitly by the psychological, although it is already implicit in both history and criticism. We must interpret words spoken or written, deeds done and sufferings borne, through the human mind of speaker, writer, doer, or sufferer. Such books as James' *Varieties of Religious Experience*, Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion*, and Davenport's *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*, to mention only a few of an alarmingly increasing multitude, are not only of keen interest, but of great value to the Christian theologian. But when we look more closely at the applications of psychology to the religious consciousness, especially to the Christian faith, we shall probably have to record the discovery of more mares' nests.

2. Before we inspect with curiosity two of these specimens of the illusions of thought, it will be well to call attention to some of the defects of the method of psychology.

(a) Modern psychology is being studied in very close alliance with physiology. If the thought of former days unduly ignored the dependence of mind on brain, of soul on body, the tendency to-day is to exaggerate the closeness of the relation. It is assumed that there is a constant and complete parallelism between mental and organic processes; and that it is the organic rather than the mental process which is determinative. But we may remind ourselves that, from the standpoint of the physicist, Sir Oliver Lodge admits that life transcends, while it utilizes, physical and chemical forces; and from the standpoint of the psychologist the late William James insists that brain is not the productive, but the permissive or transmissive organ of mind. While, in regard to sensation and movement, where the common activity of mind and body is evident, psychological investigation may establish so constant and complete correspondence, observation and experiment cannot so penetrate the inmost recesses of the inner life of the soul in religion as to demonstrate the same dependence of soul on body. In applying psychology to religion we must then beware of its physiological bias, as here one seems to be entering a realm beyond the methods of either of these sciences.

(b) But, *secondly*, psychology is compelled to abstract mental processes for their separate observation, whereas mind is a concrete unity. The method of psychology tends to be *atomic*, whereas consciousness itself is organic. Mind is a *continuum*, not a sum of states and movements. Further, psychology aims at objectivity and at observing the phenomena of mind as physics observes the phenomena of matter; but surely what is distinctive of mind is its subjectivity. Consciousness comes to its own in self-consciousness. Psychology may describe thoughts, feelings, and volitions as phenomena, but for the self these are not phenomena, as material objects are and must be for the human mind, but noumena, for they have significance and value only as its own. To ignore or neglect the subject here is to distort the reality



to be studied. If in religion especially the subjectivity is primary, the meaning and worth of the experience lying in what it is for the experient, we seem to need a very much more subtle method than any that scientific psychology has yet reached in order to interpret adequately and accurately the life of the soul, not as it *appears*, but as it *is*.

(c) A danger to be shunned is this, that the interest of the psychologist in religion may be not so much in its normal course as in its abnormal features. Conversion and revivals sometimes present psychical conditions that are unusual, and connected with them are abnormal features, and disturbances in various ways of the normal inner life. The types of religious experience selected as of special interest may present peculiarities that are not at all common to the religious life. Where psychology is thus applied to religion, it tends to become rather a pathology than a physiology (to borrow a distinction from the organic realm) of the life of the soul. It would be folly to ignore the significance of these unusual manifestations of the religious life, but it would be still more folly to depreciate in comparison with them the value of the less striking forms in which the religious life in most men expresses itself. The impression that such a one-sided treatment makes is that religion itself is something abnormal, an alien invasion of the mind of man, a hurtful disturbance of 'the even tenor of his way,' a perilous diversion from the safe path of his sanity. The proof from psychology that conversion, revival, contact and communion with God, are subjective facts, real as far as the science can test them, and not illusions and inventions, would be too dearly bought if the objective reality of the God to whom religion relates man were thereby obscured or distorted.

3. We can now turn to the first of our instances of a false application of psychology to Christian theology.

(a) We have been hearing a great deal in recent years about the *subliminal consciousness*, a rather contradictory phrase, as it describes a consciousness that is beyond, or rather below, the bounds of consciousness. Sir William Hamilton more correctly called the fact so described *mental latency*. As man is embodied mind, his consciousness has an organic basis. This consciousness is not continuous, nor is he at any moment conscious of the whole content of his mind. Impressions in

consciousness pass out of consciousness, but can be recalled to consciousness. Memory, and the sense of personal identity, suggest a continuity of mental life, uninterrupted by the transition from consciousness to unconsciousness. A train of thought, as in the solution of a problem, may have been interrupted, as in sleep; and when it is resumed, it is not exactly at the same point, but an advance toward the solution has been made, even if the solution does not at once present itself, when attention is again fixed upon the problem. The conclusion is inevitable that there is an activity, which we must describe as *mental*, that is not entirely within our consciousness. It has been recently held that the source of religion is in the *unconscious*; that it is in the processes beyond the margin of consciousness that the real contact of the soul with God takes place; and that the conscious part of religion may be the least part of the total reality of that contact.

(b) If in God we live and move and have our being, if He is the spiritual environment, as nature is the physical environment, of our life, it is assuredly true that we are not conscious of the whole contact with either the one or the other environment. Our body is affected by the world in our breathing, feeding, moving, by light and heat, in far more ways than we are ever aware of; and so doubtless our souls are being influenced by God far beyond the measure of our consciousness. But it is most desirable that we should not confuse the distinction between our dependence on the physical universe through our body, and on God in our spirits, which are in His likeness and for His fellowship, by the use of the same term for that part of the contact that falls not within our consciousness. By so doing we mix up organic processes and spiritual experiences, and so encourage the tendency already noted, of allying psychology too closely with physiology. If we use *subliminal* for such mental activity out of consciousness as is directly dependent on organic conditions, we should use such a term as *supraliminal* for all of our life in God that lies beyond our consciousness; and if the purpose of our ordinary life is to rise as far as we can out of the depths of the subliminal into clear consciousness, so it should be the aspiration of our religious life to lift our consciousness to the heights of what still is to us *supraliminal*, but what a finer and keener spiritual discernment might secure as a known reality for us.

(c) It seems of the utmost importance to insist on this distinction, for we must not confuse the moral ideals and spiritual aspirations which summon us to realize ever more fully the spiritual environment in which our life is with God with the organic processes on which much of our mental activity as embodied spirits necessarily depends, and with the natural impulses and emotional disturbances that arise from our dependence on the body as affected by the world around. We obscure the meaning and deprecate the worth of religion by making it so dependent, as psychologists often do, on only partially understood organic processes. Conversion is not merely a natural event, an *epi-phenomenon* of adolescence, as some treatments of the subject suggest. Revivals are not explained fully by the *mob-mind*. It may be frankly admitted that emotions especially are affected by organic conditions; but that influence does not give them their distinctive religious character, but the object for the mind with which they happen to be associated. If God comes to man, makes Himself known, and enters into fellowship, it will be along channels of communication congruous with His nature, character, and purpose, in the vision of the seer, in the aspiration of the saint, in the wisdom of the sage, in the achievement of the hero. To use a figure that may more vividly present the contrast: He will not creep in by some back door into the cellar of life, but will enter by the open windows in the upper chambers of the soul.

4. One of the most serious and lamentable applications of the conception of the *subliminal consciousness* in Christian theology is the attempt recently made by Dr. Sanday to solve the problem of Christology thereby.

(a) For Dr. Sanday as a New Testament scholar there can be only the highest possible respect; but the interests of the truth demand all the more urgently that so great a peril to constructive Christian thought should be clearly pointed out. Assuming that the *locus* of the divine in man is the subliminal, Dr. Sanday tries to relegate the divine nature of Christ to that region, with only occasional incursions of the divinity into the realm of the strictly human consciousness. As one of our most candid scholars he has on the one hand been so impressed by the evidence of the real

human consciousness, experience, character of Jesus, which modern scholarship forces upon us; and on the other, as a loyal churchman, he is anxious to preserve as much of the orthodox Christology as he possibly can. This reconciliation, however, carries us into the region of the unknown; it has just as much value as Spencer's reconciliation of philosophy and religion in his doctrine of the *Unknowable*. If, apart from only occasional manifestations within consciousness, we dismiss the divinity of Jesus to the subliminal region, we preserve the orthodox Christology only in name. The value of Christ's person for Christian faith lies here first of all, and most of all, that in Him divinity is not concealed, but revealed.

(b) Dr. Sanday's method of approach to the problem seems to be altogether wrong; reason has already been given why psychology should be used with caution and a recognition of its obvious limitations in Christian theology, and why especially this conception of the *subliminal consciousness* is inadequate to explain religion. The problem should be approached rather through philosophy than psychology, through an idealism less intellectualist and speculative than Hegel's and more ethical and spiritual, through what the writer ventures to call *personalism*. The conception of personality is the clue through the labyrinth, and not this will-o'-the-wisp of the subliminal consciousness. If we form an adequate conception of human personality, laying the stress, not on its organic dependence and its obscurer features, but on its self-consciousness, on its ideals and aspirations, on its upward trend, not its downward drag; if we apply—as we are not only entitled by such a philosophy, but compelled by the religious consciousness of communion with God, to do—this conception to God; and if with Lotze we recognize that God is perfect, and man progressive, personality—then we can think of Christ as the meeting-place of God's downward movement in grace and man's upward movement in faith; and we shall find both His typical humanity and His real divinity, not in the obscurities of the subliminal, but in the unity in Him of divine truth with human thought, divine goodness with human deed, divine love with human heart. His perfect human consciousness reveals and conveys His real divine relation.



## Literature.

DAVID HAY FLEMING, LL.D.

FEW are the reviewers who would care to see every scrap of a review they ever wrote republished and preserved in book form. But Dr. Hay Fleming has himself collected his reviews together, whether they were contributed to the *Bookman*, the *British Weekly*, the *Fife Herald*, or the *St. Andrews Citizen*, and has re-issued them in a handsome octavo volume under the title of *Critical Reviews relating chiefly to Scotland* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net). What is more surprising, he has set down side by side reviews of the same book which he had contributed to different periodicals, not afraid of either repetition or contradiction.

And in all this he is justified, and more than justified. There is no contradiction; there is no repetition; the reviews of the same book illustrate and enforce one another; every article is written in an easy and attractive literary style, and whets the appetite for the next article. So well informed is Dr. Hay Fleming within his own range of subject, that he never reviews a book without telling us what is the value of the book and at the same time adding to its value. The authors of books reviewed by Dr. Hay Fleming might do worse than print his review as an introduction to their next edition. In some cases, such as Hume Brown's histories, it would be approval as well as instruction; in other cases, such as Andrew Lang's, the instruction would greatly exceed the approval.

### CHURCH AND MANOR.

'The economic history of mediæval England will gain much in simplicity if it can be shown that lord and priest were once the same person; that the hall cannot at an early time be distinguished from the church; and that ecclesiastical benefices were themselves manors, with all the privileges which belonged to feudal lordship.'

This is the sum and substance of a handsome volume, entitled *Church and Manor: A Study in English Economic History*, which has been written by Mr. Sidney Oldall Addy, M.A. (George Allen; 10s. 6d. net). But it is not to be understood that Mr. Addy invented his thesis and then searched for

materials to establish it. The identity of church and manor came as a great surprise in the course of his studies in mediæval life. The fact that the church was not only God's house, but also in the most homely sense man's; that the lord, who was also the priest, did not distinguish between his dwelling-place and his place of worship—that fact emerged slowly, as research proceeded, and at last was proved to be a fact unmistakably. The evidence is ample and it is admirably brought before us: for Mr. Addy has a fine sense of the rights of the reader of history, his right to have the picture imaginatively conceived and then worked out to a finish.

And in the course of this process there emerge some details that are themselves surprising enough. 'There were married English priests in the eighth century who were not in holy orders. Bede speaks of "clerks not in holy orders" (*clerici extra sacros ordines*), and they in the Anglo-Saxon version are described as "preostas," priests. They were doubtless hereditary priests, for we must remember that it was not until the twelfth century that the marriage of priests was declared to be invalid.

'Centuries after Bede's time "clerks not in holy orders" were often rectors of churches. Thus William de Saham, one of the Justices of the King's Bench, a sub-deacon, was rector of Kirkby Wiske, in Yorkshire, and also of certain benefices in the dioceses of York and Winchester. For holding these livings he had not obtained papal dispensation, but on his own petition this was granted in 1291, in consideration that he was aged, and had spent all his life in the king's service. He was, however, to be ordained priest, and to give a portion of the fruits to the churches of Kirkby Wiske and King's Clere, which he then held. In the thirteenth century it was usual for benefices to be held by sub-deacons, so that rectors were only nominally in orders. They could neither celebrate mass nor administer the sacraments.'

### THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

What a pity it is that a man of Mr. Frederic Harrison's ability and earnestness should have handicapped himself through life by adopting a

creed so unfruitful and unelevating as that of Positivism. How hard he has worked for it, and how ably. There is scarcely a better lecturer in England; there is scarcely a better writer of the English language. But what has it all come to? He himself confesses, in a book which he has just published under the title of *The Positive Evolution of Religion* (Heinemann; 8s. 6d. net), that 'the numbers of Comte's adherents are few, scattered, and increasing slowly in comparison with many religious movements around us.'

But its own failure as a religion is not the worst of it. The worst of it is, that it is not really a religion. It may be called Positivism, but it is the negative of every kind of religious belief. And the result is that its adherents, including Mr. Harrison himself with all his candour, are utterly unable to appreciate that which makes the reality of religion—faith in a personal God.

Mr. Harrison is even driven to make as little of Christ as possible. Imagine the state of mind of a man who can deliberately write down such a sentence as this: 'We are bound to place the life and death of Paul far higher than that of Jesus by reason of his grander intellect, his modern conception of reform, his nobler humanity, and his profounder moral insight.'

Again, Mr. Harrison is driven to the defence of extraordinary things in the religion of his adoption. He is driven to the defence of Comte's amazing declaration on Polytheism: 'Polytheism is the most characteristic, most important, most durable, and most efficacious form which the theological type of religion has ever taken. The worship of one deity never has, and never can, produce so potent a type of religion as the worship of *many* deities has done and does.' His defence of this notion is really a repudiation of it. But in repudiating it he has to appear to accept it, and the effect of that and the like of it upon a man's mind is incalculably bad.

In this volume Mr. Harrison criticizes all the forms of religion which at the present time have life in them, and he criticizes them very cleverly. But it is not more than cleverness. He does not once touch the heart of Christianity; he does not see that it has a heart. And then, when he comes to expound the Religion of Humanity, his failure is so conspicuous as to be ludicrous—he simply shows that there is no religion in it.

### WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

The fourth volume has been issued of the Standard Edition of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (Kelly). It contains parts ix. to xiii., and covers the years 1751 to 1765.

It is a constant surprise that every time Wesley's Journal is taken up it can be read with interest. Custom does not stale its infinite perfection. In this volume Wesley is seen in labours abundant as before; he goes over the same ground repeatedly, but there never is the sense of repetition, for there never *is* repetition. The endless variety of human experience and the endless variety of the Gospel message are both continually in evidence.

In addition to the footnotes, which do not need to be so numerous now, the Editor has written six extended notes. The last of these shows in what measure Wesley altered his attitude to Christian perfection under the pressure of the extravagant claims of George Bell and others. Here is a curious entry, showing the change that has come over the meaning of the word 'enthusiasm.' The date is December 22, 1762. 'I heard George Bell once more, and was convinced he must not continue to pray at the Foundery. The reproach of Christ I am willing to bear, but not the reproach of enthusiasm, if I can help it.'

The first of these extended notes deals with the Sermon Register. It shows that mighty as were Wesley's labours, they were mightier than the Journal records. For often when the Journal simply says 'Preached,' the Sermon Register shows that he preached in the evening after arrival at a place, expounded in a society-meeting, preached at five the following morning, and again in the open air before departing.

Here is another interesting item from the Register. Wesley did not win pulpit popularity on the strength of a comparatively small handful of sermons. Certain sermons useful as manifestoes, as expositions of doctrine, or as means of effectual appeal, were preached frequently. But these were supplemented by a large number of sermons new or newly remade. In this register he has summarized the preaching of fifteen years thus: The services held are grouped in forty-three sets varying from 40 to 234 services in each, giving a total of sermons preached between 1747 and 1761. A pencil note, partly obliterated,



analyses the texts: Old Testament, 266; New Testament, 1088,—a total of 1354.

### THE NEW GUINEA PYGMIES.

Captain C. G. Rawling, C.I.E., F.R.G.S., went on an expedition into the heart of New Guinea and had the great good fortune to come upon a race of pygmies never before seen by a white man. His first impression was that they were the degenerate descendants of known races in that district. But there are no such degenerate races. Pygmies, it is now known, are everywhere a different race. Captain Rawling found that the Tapiros had lived there for countless ages, lived and died there in the densest forest and in the fastnesses of the mountains. 'They were of good proportions, strong and wiry, without any signs of deformity or dwarfishness, and in colour a dark chocolate. When walking with the finely-developed men of the Parimau tribe, their small size was very noticeable,—the former averaging about five feet six to seven inches, whilst the new-comers, as we were to find in camp, barely reached four feet seven inches in height.'

Captain Rawling tells his story, and tells it well, in a book entitled *The Land of the New Guinea Pygmies* (Seeley, Service & Co.; 16s. net). Here is his account of a marriage ceremony. For the most part, he says, there is no ceremony at all; the young man and young woman simply go and live together. But 'it does sometimes happen in the case of an important member of the tribe that the marriage is marked by festivities and singing, though even this is exceptional. Such an occurrence was witnessed by Goodfellow at Wakatimi, when the nuptials of one of the principal men of the tribe were celebrated. On this occasion a large awning was erected in the village street and decorated with much trade cloth; beneath this a concert was held at which the members of the tribe were present. The singing was kept up all night, and in the morning canoes, decorated with carving and fringes of grass, left the village for some spot down-stream. Some few hours afterwards they returned, and the men disembarked and re-entered their huts. Then followed what to our eyes was a most pitiable and degrading ceremony. Out of one of the boats emerged the bride, accompanied by a very old woman—probably her mother. No welcome was

accorded them, and no notice taken of their presence. The bride, preceded by the old woman, crawled out of the canoe into the mud, and on her hands and knees approached the hut of her lord in the same way that a dog crawls up to his master, knowing that he is to be punished for some fault. Slowly she advanced in this degrading posture, stopping every now and then to grovel in the mud, until she vanished through the doorway of her future home. Poor woman, who could not but pity her!'

What is the religion of the Tapiro pygmies? 'There is nothing,' says Captain Rawling, 'to indicate that these savages have any definite belief in a Deity, nor did we observe any signs of religious worship. In front of the principal huts in the village of Nimé stood a rudely carved figure of a man, about four feet in height. Another and similar idol was propped against a tree in the village of Atabo, whilst a third was discovered in some bushes half way up the Mimika, apparently brought down and washed ashore by a flood. The natives showed no respect for any of these idols, but laughed at our interest in them, familiarly patting their rather shapeless limbs. So long had the third specimen been in the position in which it was discovered that a branch had grown through the ribs, whilst the fact that it had remained there such a length of time showed of how little value it was in the eyes of those who had fashioned its malformed body.'

### CHINESE MISSIONARIES.

'Art for art's sake'? No, Mr. J. Macgowan opens his preface with a sentence which he gives in a paragraph all by itself, and the sentence is, 'This book has been written with a purpose.'

Yet it is a book of art. The complaint is that missionary books are dull. Mr. Macgowan has artfully contrived to deliver his book on missions from all accusation of dullness. He has himself a lively style, and he has been particular to render his narrative entertaining by the free use of conversation. Missionaries as a rule avoid conversations. Who can remember the exact words of a conversation? And if you cannot remember the exact words, what right have you to pretend to remember? So reasons the strictly truthful missionary, and writes a dull book. Mr. Macgowan writes an interesting book by the free

use of the imagination in conversation and otherwise. The free use of the imagination, but its legitimate use as a work of art. It conveys the truth better than does the dull book.

Here is one of the conversations.

‘On one occasion we had a nurse in our family whom we had engaged to help to look after our children. She was a tall, vigorous woman, ungainly and uncouth in her manners, but with a heart full of tenderness in spite of the rough way in which she had been brought up in her country home. She quite won our hearts by the patient, loving way in which she treated our children. No matter how tried she might be by her little charges, her temper never became ruffled, but with a gentleness that might have shamed many an English maid she won their hearts by her evident love for them.

‘There was one thing that I used to wonder at, and that was her name. It was such an unusual one for a woman to bear. The Chinese usually call their girls by the names of beautiful and fragrant flowers, or of delicate colours, or something poetic that would harmonize with a girl’s nature. But she had one that seemed utterly meaningless and most unromantic — namely, “Picked up.”

‘I felt convinced there was a history behind it, so one day I asked her to tell me why her mother had given her this extraordinary name. A smile passed over her rugged, kindly features, and she said—

“I can easily explain that to you. The evening that I was born, when my mother discovered that I was a girl, she became greatly distressed. Every one had hoped that I would be a boy, and now, after months of expectation, I was only a girl. She felt that she would lose face with all the women down the street, and they would look with contempt and derision upon her. Ah! how different it would have been if I had only been a boy. Congratulations would already have been pouring in upon her, and fire-crackers would have been sending their noisy echoes abroad telling the passers-by and those who caught the joyous sounds that a son had been born.

“But the room was silent, and the only sounds that were to be heard were the noisy beating of her heart and her suppressed sobs at the disgrace that had fallen upon her.

“By and by my father came in. He had heard

the news, and he was wild with disappointment, and exceedingly bitter in his feelings towards my mother because she had given him a girl instead of the hoped-for heir. Seeing me lying on the couch, in a fit of fury he seized hold upon me and, rushing to the door, he threw me out into the open courtyard in front.

“It was summer-time, and the weather was exceedingly hot, and, besides, I was an exceptionally healthy child, so my exposure during the night did me no harm. At early dawn my father came out to look at me, and to his astonishment he saw that I was moving. Whether he was superstitious or not I cannot say, but he came and picked me up, and brought me to my mother and placed me in her arms. I suppose that during the night the mother-love had been growing in her heart, for she did not repel me, but drew me lovingly and caressingly to her bosom, and so to commemorate my wonderful escape from death I was given the name of ‘Picked up.’” And as she finished her story her broad Doric countenance, that seemed to be the very incarnation of a loving, tender disposition, was suffused with a smile, and she burst into laughter as though she had been telling some humorous story that had appeared most comical to her.’

The title of Mr. Macgowan’s book is *How England saved China* (Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). England saved China by means of the Christian missionaries. The book is a strong plea for the recognition of the missionary as the purest and best of all agencies for the advancement of civilization.

---

Two famous volumes of sermons have been brought within the compass of the slender purse by Mr. Allenson. To his sixpenny series he has added Westcott’s *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles* and Church’s *The Gifts of Civilisation*.

---

Mr. Allenson has also published new editions of S. A. Tipple’s *Sunday Mornings at Norwood* (3s. 6d. net) and of Samuel Gregory’s *Among the Roses* (3s. 6d.). Both volumes are as nearly as possible the perfection of their kind. Mr. Tipple had a way of seeing the meaning of a text which was like inspiration, and his style of exposition was a fine blending of reason and imagination. He made you see with the spirit and with the



understanding also. Of Samuel Gregory's addresses to children the only fear the publisher need have is that they are in all our hands already. Both volumes are quite handsome in appearance.

We hope that we are not to have a separate version of the Bible for every church and denomination. Yet we welcome *An Improved Edition of the Holy Bible*, which has been prepared by Baptist scholars, and published by the American Baptist Publication Society (\$1.00 net). For it is, as we have said, the work of scholars, and it does undoubtedly offer us not a few renderings that are both new and acceptable.

It would take too long to do any justice to the work by quotations from it, but we may notice one or two little things. In Ro 1<sup>4</sup> we observe the word 'instated'—'who was instated as the Son of God with power.' R.V. is 'declared' and R.V.m 'determined.' After the word 'baptize,' wherever it occurs, 'immerse' is inserted within parentheses. Square brackets are often used to bring out the sense. Thus He 11<sup>1,2</sup> is rendered: 'Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, conviction of things not seen. For in [the exercise of] this the elders obtained a good testimony.' The paraclete is rendered 'Helper' in place of the A.V. 'comforter.' And, as in the Standard American version, we have Jehovah always in place of 'the LORD' in the Old Testament.

*The First Book of Samuel* is now ready in the series entitled 'The Revised Version edited for the use of Schools.' The editor is the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. 6d. net). Dr. Oesterley's work is always conscientious and up to date. This little book has cost him something.

The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature now include a sketch of *Comparative Religion* by Professor F. B. Jevons, and a succinct account of what is known about *Ancient Babylonia*, by Dr. C. H. W. Johns (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. net each). Both authors are the men who occur to one as the first to be asked to write these books. And they have written them well.

*The Scottish Prayer Book*, being the Book of Common Prayer, with all the Additions and Variations canonically sanctioned in Scotland incor-

porated into the text. Published on behalf of the Publication Committee of the Episcopal Church in Scotland (Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 100 Princes Street; 3s. 6d. net).

Such (on the cover) is the luminous abstract of a very elaborate title-page. To complete the explanation, [it is necessary to give a note found opposite the page of contents: 'The portions of this book which are marked by a marginal line are permissible additions to and deviations from the Service Books of the Scottish Church as canonically sanctioned.'

The type is large, clean and beautiful. The paper is thin but perfectly opaque. The volume is both handy and handsome.

Mr. G. F. Hill of the British Museum, front-rank scholar, first-rate writer, has given us an ideal edition of *The Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza*, by Mark the Deacon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 3s. 6d. net). He has translated the work into idiomatic English, and by introduction and notes has done everything that can or need be done for its elucidation. Among the rest he has written a history of that interesting city called Gaza. We know our Bible better than our Church History, and so Gaza is to us a city of the Philistines. Where did the Philistines come from? 'Whether they went to Crete from Palestine or came to Palestine from Crete,' there is no doubt now that they did the one or the other, and Mr. Hill believes that they came to Palestine from Crete. What a curious fact it is that they gave their name to the whole country, and that it is the name that has maintained itself.

The Schweich Lectures, so notably started by Professor Driver of Oxford, so capably continued by Professor Kennett of Cambridge, were delivered in 1910 by Dr. George Adam Smith, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen. Dr. Smith's subject is Hebrew poetry, and he has now published the lectures under the title of *The Early Poetry of Israel in its Physical and Social Origins* (Clarendon Press; 3s. net). The title is a long one; the author was anxious not to seem to offer more than he did offer, and at the same time he wished to call attention to the fact that he has in preparation a work on the whole subject of Hebrew poetry. For that book the present volume will give us all an appetite.

Dr. Smith has first transliterated and then translated the early poetry of the Bible, and after the translation he has written what may be called a critical commentary, with occasional footnotes. It is a popular book in the right sense of that adjective, for there are no Hebrew letters on the page, and those who can make little of the transliteration may use the translation, which is always Dr. Smith's own, and always instinct with life. Into the commentary and the notes there have been dropped, as if unconsciously, many items of geographical and religious interest, one of which may be quoted as an example.

'Every traveller on the desert is familiar with the mysterious crackling which rises into the still air on the fall of a cold night. It is this which probably suggested the belief so prevalent among the Semites that the dry places of the desert—as distinguished from those regions of the earth which a god has manifestly endowed for himself with water and fertility—are thronged by jinns and demons innumerable, which, however, invade from there the houses and persons of the inhabitants of settled lands. A curious trace of this imagination occurs in the parable of our Lord where the unclean spirit driven out of a man walked through *dry places* seeking rest and returned to the house from whence he came out. Musil tells us that the Skhûr, the great Arab tribe on the eastern border of Moab, "hear at night in the desert all sorts of voices, al-mfâyel"; and that "female spirits, ad-daffafiyât, appear in the desert every night from Thursday to Friday, playing on tambourines, ad-dûf, beating drums, at-tbûl, and dancing to them. No one dare approach these, else he must dance with them till he falls down dead." And again, "in the desert one must not whistle, for whoso whistles calls the devils together, therefore every Sakhari gets angry with whistling and bids the whistler cease." I once asked one of my servants, not a Bedawee but a city-bred Syrian, to draw some water for me after dark from a cistern in the desert of Judæa. He excused himself, and when I insisted he trembled. When I said, "What do you fear? You will see nothing there," he replied: "It is not what I shall see, but what I cannot see, that I fear." I know what he was thinking: that the unseen spirits might crowd and hustle him into the water, as he bent over it to draw.'

Constable have published a translation, with notes and introduction, of Lucian's *De Dea Syria* (4s. net). The translation is by Professor Herbert A. Strong, M.A., LL.D.; the notes and introduction are by Mr. John Garstang, M.A., D.Sc. The volume contains also a Life of Lucian by Professor Strong.

Lucian's *De Dea Syria* is one of the indispensable books to the student of Religion, and this is a nearly perfect edition of it. *Nearly* perfect: it was with a shock of surprise that we came upon this reference on page 53: '*vide* Koenig in *Hastings's Abrig. Dict.*, p. 70b.' Both names are misspelt; but the serious thing is that the single-volume Dictionary of the Bible is not abridged. All the articles in it were written anew, quite independently of those in the five-volume edition, and by different men. The surprise was so great because the mistake is so solitary. More commendable work for clearness and scholarship could not be desired.

Professor Alexander Souter has contributed a volume to Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology' on *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (2s. 6d. net). The text is done most fully. The Canon undoubtedly occupies too little space, but Professor Souter has endeavoured to make up for that by printing at the end an admirably chosen and most valuable set of Selected Documents. Perhaps the Text and the Canon should have occupied each a volume of the series; within his space Professor Souter has done better than almost any other man would have done. His notes on literature are particularly useful. Here is one of them:

'J. J. Wettstein edited the Greek Testament in two folio volumes (Amsterdam, 1751-52), with a learned commentary. So valuable is the amount of illustrative material, particularly from classical and Jewish literature, that those who know the commentary best would not hesitate to place it first among all that ever one man has produced. It is no less valuable to-day than it was before, though succeeding commentators have plundered it.'

Then comes this footnote: 'May I join my plea to that of Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin, that a new edition of this work should be undertaken? No one could render a greater service to New Testament study than by devoting a life-

Under the title of *The Syrian Goddess*, Messrs.



time to the satisfactory performance of this task.'

There is a cheap edition this month of a volume of sermons by Stopford Brooke. Take a note of it. All the old literary finish is in it, all the old love of preaching, all the old optimism. 'I am glad,' he says, 'before I pass away, to have seen the beginnings of a regeneration of society. I am glad to believe that it will be wrought, not, as of old in France, by violence and revenge, but by patient, constitutional work, in ardent faith and hope; and that the stones of its temples will be cemented by forgiveness, their halls built by justice, and their foundation be the brotherhood of man in the Fatherhood of God. Therefore, the vision that I see is not the fierce and destroying vision of the apocalyptic seer, such as was fulfilled in the agony of France, of the rain of plagues, and of blood up to the horse-bridles, of hell opening her mouth without measure to swallow the ancient wrongs, but of the wrong-doers, in sorrow for their wrong, led into right by a people willing to forget and forgive.'

This is the note of the book; and in a man who is 'ready to depart' it is a note of felt encouragement. Characteristically he translates the words 'As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing' of 2 Co 6<sup>10</sup> 'as serious, yet rejoicing,' and makes them the subject of a strong buoyant sermon. He speaks of 'the brightness of the Christian life, and its joyousness, its eagerness in battle, its hope in the storm, its certainty of victory.'

The title of the book is *The Onward Cry* (Duckworth; 2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Kirkwood Hewat, M.A., F.S.A. (Scot.), has been spending the *Leisure Hours of a Scottish Minister* in writing papers on various subjects (Paisley: Gardner; 3s. 6d.). Half of the subjects are Scottish and half are foreign. Mr. Hewat is most at home when he *is* at home, though his 'travel pictures' are quite good reading. Among the Scottish themes there are recollections of Principal Rainy. Of these recollections (not all flattering) we quote two.

'Here I may say that I have sometimes wondered that in public notices of Dr. Rainy—and, for that matter, also in private conversations regarding him—so little, if indeed anything, has been said about his wonderful smile. It was the

most beautiful and winning smile I ever saw on the face of a man. It was like that of a bright, bashful boy, lighting up his face and giving it a most attractive expression. To look at Dr. Rainy standing in the Assembly and, with solemn mien, addressing it in grave tones, or sitting listening to a debate with his face in repose—serene, calm, almost sad-looking; and then to see him on some other occasion or meet him in the street, with that wonderful smile lighting up the whole face, was as if to behold two different men. But, curiously enough, though I often saw Dr. Rainy with that happy expression, I never on any occasion heard him laugh.'

'He was very quiet and gentle, with the heart of a child. He was a holy man who was our guest, and we felt no unworthy word could be uttered in his presence. The children loved him, and consequently one is not surprised that a little mite—one of his own grandchildren—did not wish to include him in her prayers amongst those relatives who were to be "made good," her reason being "Because, you know, grandpapa is all good already!"'

Under the title of *Nuggets from the Bible Mine* a volume has been published of short sermons, or extracts from sermons, by the Rev. W. Tuckwell, sometime Fellow of New College, Oxford (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). They are just such expositions as a careful scholar might be expected to give in the pulpit while introducing the practical part of his sermon. And that is all that we ask as a rule from a printed sermon. The application must be every preacher's own, according to the circumstances of his hearers. But the knowledge of the truth to be applied becomes ours through study of the Word itself and every expert assistance we can call upon.

One of the most successful books of recent years on the Old Testament is Canon Foakes-Jackson's *Biblical History of the Hebrews*. Canon Foakes-Jackson has now, in collaboration with Mr. B. T. Dean Smith, M.A., prepared and issued a companion volume for the study of the New Testament. Its title is *A Biblical History for Schools (New Testament)*. The publishers are Messrs. Heffer (3s. 6d. net).

The difficulty of being at once faithful to the assured results of modern research, and at the same

time alive to the demands of the weak conscience, is becoming as great in the exposition of the New Testament as it has ever been in the exposition of the Old. The great value of this book lies in its equal reverence for truth and conscience. Thus it makes for progress.

Mr. F. B. Meyer in his book on *Expository Preaching* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net) writes as if he were the advocate of an abandoned cause. It is not so. There has been an interregnum, but it is over. Preachers have everywhere been driven back to the Bible, and the exposition of a passage is again a popular style of preaching. So the book which Mr. Meyer has written will fall as seed on prepared soil, and his 'plans and methods' will bear fruit. There is more in it than plans and methods, however. There are fresh sensitive expositions of some great passages.

'The temper of the present age is utilitarian. Everybody is looking for results.' And accordingly Mr. George Arthur Andrews has written a book to tell us, not what Christianity is, but what is the use of it. It is good for this life. It gives us health, confidence, comfort, joy, and other things which are very useful for the battle of life.

Well, it is quite a legitimate way of considering Christianity. And Mr. Andrews knows as well as any of us that it is not the best way. He knows that we must seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness without regard to advantages. But he also knows that the advantages will follow, and that they also are good.

The title which he has given to his book is *Efficient Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

Messrs. T. C. and E. C. Jack have sent out the fifth dozen of 'The People's Books' (6d. net each). Four of the twelve are biographies—*Wellington and Waterloo*, by Major G. W. Redway; *Wordsworth*, by Miss Rosaline Masson; *Cecil John Rhodes*, by Mr. Ian D. Colvin; and *Nietzsche*, by Mr. M. A. Mügge. Four are scientific surveys—*Zoology*; or, *The Study of Animal Life*, by Professor E. W. MacBride; *Psychology*, by Dr. H. J. Watt; *The Nature of Mathematics*, by Mr. P. E. B. Jourdain; and *Everyday Law*, by Mr. J. J. Adams. Finally, four are miscellaneous and most interesting. *Turkey and the Eastern Question* by Mr. John

Macdonald, is just in time, and it will have a great circulation; for it gives all the information required by intelligent people, and it is both popularly and accurately written. *The Bible and Criticism*, by Professor W. H. Bennett and Principal W. F. Adeney, brings the well-known book by these scholars up to date, condensing it cleverly. A lively description of a lively community is *Pond Life*, by Mr. E. C. Ash. But the book of the dozen is an *Atlas* in full colours, and containing fifty-six maps, by Mr. J. Bartholomew. We had formerly to pay the sixpence for one map.

Unlike the Scotch woman who 'wadna presume' to understand an ordinary sermon, Mr. R. J. Wardell understands all the modern philosophers and all their philosophies, and enables us to understand them, even including the redoubtable Hans Driesch. His book is entitled *Contemporary Philosophy* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). It explains every one of the modern movements in philosophy in simple words. Difficulties are not evaded, they are made easy. No longer will it be good form to speak of the unintelligibility of philosophers. They simply require the patience and mastery of language which Mr. Wardell has at command.

Simple and inconsequential but very practical are the hints on *Preaching and Pastoral Care* which Bishop A. C. A. Hall of Vermont gives in his book with that title (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). He has read the literature of his subject, but, better than that, he has preached, and he has taken charge of a parish. He is particularly anxious to encourage expository preaching. The difficulty in the way of it is the existence of the lessons. What he suggests is that after the regular service, or at some other hour, a service should be held which would consist entirely of an expository sermon. He commends for our instruction the volumes of expository preaching by Dale, Maclaren, and Gore.

The Rev. J. M. Connell has prepared and published *A Book of Devotional Readings from the Literature of Christendom* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). His first quotation is of the 'New Sayings of Jesus': his last is from Tolstoy's *My Religion*. The quotations are in chronological order. There is enough quoted to make sense, but there is never a superfluous sentence. Thus the number



is very great and very widely representative. What is the purpose of the book? First of all it has been prepared for private devotion; but in the second place it is offered as a supplement to the reading of Scripture in public worship.

The Rev. William H. Saulez, M.A., B.D., Rector of Ninfield, has written a book for the purpose of encouraging the study of the Hebrew language. By its title, *The Romance of the Hebrew Language* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), and by its contents, it reminds us of Mr. Adams's volumes, *Sermons in Accents* and *Sermons in Syntax*. But Mr. Adams has two advantages. He can write more vigorously, and he commands the most reliable literature. Mr. Saulez has a good enough prose style but it never wakens us up. More serious, however, is his dependence on books that are out of date, like Smith's three-volume Dictionary of the Bible and Tregelles' edition of Gesenius's Lexicon. Not to use the Oxford Lexicon is unpardonable. It is perhaps only by a slip that he makes Neubauer the author of three volumes of the *Studia Biblica* instead of an essay in one of the volumes.

Dr. George Matheson was credited with the discovery of the Beast of the Apocalypse. The number of the Beast? he said; it is Number One. In like manner the Rev. John Neville Figgis may be credited with the discovery of Antichrist. It is the spirit of pure pleasure that is abroad in the world. 'Look round about you. Think of what lives and moves in London, or Paris, or Tripoli, or the whole of what is called the civilised world. Does it not almost seem as if those thousand years of Satan's binding, which had set in with the peace of the Church under Constantine, had been done with some centuries, and that the spirit of Antichrist, cold, pitiless, beautiful in arrogant evil, glorying in open triumph, was now abroad among us and daily grew more insulting?'

Mr. Figgis has issued a volume of Sermons of which the title is *Antichrist and other Sermons* (Longmans; 5s. net). 'Antichrist' is the title of the first sermon. Every sermon which succeeds it is as alive to the social life of to-day, and to the necessity and adequacy of the gospel for its salvation.

There is a fine sense of the leisure of God in the

sermons of John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' God is great, and they who are God's have all the quietness and confidence of greatness. There is no sense of the rush of the present in these sermons, the title of which is simply *Sermons preached in Salisbury Cathedral Church and Elsewhere* (Longmans; 5s. net). There are no time limitations of any sort. Nearly all are quite short, but they end when their subjects end. And their subjects range through past, present, and future. Here is a characteristic paragraph:

'If we try to put the New Testament view of heaven, as distinguished from the natural view of heaven, plainly in one word, we shall say that it is a life of *education*. It is not indolent resting in sunshine or keen satisfaction of healthy appetites, but it is progressive work for God. It is a pastoral charge, a duty to make disciples of all nations, to carry the message of salvation, to produce a true sense of sin and its remedy, to preach the Gospel to the creation. And if we consider the matter in the light of Christian commonsense, humbly attempting to enter into the great counsels of God, and not following the vague emotions which make up the ordinary thoughts, if we may call them thoughts at all, of heaven, the life must clearly be of that kind. God's will is to bring all men to the knowledge of truth; and men remaining men and not being changed to angels—though "equal to the angels" in their immortality—all men will have much to learn.'

Professor Walter Rauschenbusch of Rochester Theological Seminary in the United States has made himself famous by his book on *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. And his fame has given him work to do. For since the issue of that book he has had to answer innumerable people who have come to him with the question, What shall we do then? This has taken him away from his proper field, which is Church History, and compelled him to write another book on the relation of Christianity to Social conditions. He has called the new book *Christianizing the Social Order* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net).

What does he mean by that? This is his answer. 'Christianizing the social order means bringing it into harmony with the ethical convictions which we identify with Christ. A fairly definite body of moral convictions has taken shape

in modern humanity. They express our collective conscience, our working religion. The present social order denies and flouts many of these principles of our ethical life and compels us in practice to outrage our better self. We demand therefore that the moral sense of humanity shall be put in control and shall be allowed to reshape the institutions of social life.

'We call this "christianizing" the social order because these moral principles find their highest expression in the teachings, the life, and the spirit of Jesus Christ. Their present power in Western civilization is in large part directly traceable to his influence over its history. To the great majority of our nation, both inside and outside of the churches, he has become the incarnate moral law, and his name is synonymous with the ideal of human goodness. To us who regard him as the unique revelation of God, the unfolding of the divine life under human forms, he is the ultimate standard of moral and spiritual life, the perfect expression of the will of God for humanity, the categorical imperative with a human heart. But very many who do not hold this belief in a formulated way, or who feel compelled to deny it, including an increasing portion of our Jewish fellow-citizens, will still consent that in Jesus our race has reached one of its highest points, if not its crowning summit thus far, so that Jesus Christ is a prophecy of the future glory of humanity, the type of Man as he is to be. Christianizing means humanizing in the highest sense. I ask the consent of both classes to use his name for the undertaking which he initiated for us. To say that we want to moralize the social order would be both vague and powerless to most men. To say that we want to christianize it is both concrete and compelling. Christ's spirit is the force that drives us. His mind is the square and plumb line that must guide us in our building.'

Messrs. Macmillan have issued *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone* in a new edition (10s. net). The book is still in octavo, and has the two fine photogravures of Lord Acton himself and the group taken at Tegernsee in 1879, which includes, besides Lord Acton, Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone, Herbert and Mary Gladstone, and Döllinger.

The letters have become part of our standard biography. But Mr. Herbert Paul's introductory

memoir is almost as fine—both for literature and for fact—as the letters are. It is, moreover, a true introduction; without it the letters would have less interest than they have.

'Three kinds of books there are. First, those that give nothing and from which we demand nothing. These constitute the greater portion of the book-world; empty entertainment for the idle. Secondly, those books that give the unfamiliar and are unfamiliar to us—that is, demand only our memory. These are manuals of instruction presenting facts. And thirdly, those books that give themselves, and demand ourselves.'

Again: 'Three kinds of men there are. First, the indifferent, comparable to the inert bodies of chemistry. To them applies the saying of Confucius, "Rotten wood cannot be turned." Secondly, the believers, comparable to those chemical bodies whose affinities are satisfied. In so far as their faith is genuine, to these applies already during their lifetime, the parable of beggar Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. And thirdly there is the thinking class, destitute of faith, corresponding to chemical bodies in the nascent state. To them applies that word of the Buddha, "Painful is all life."'

Those generalizations of books and men are given by Dr. Paul Dahlke in his book on *Buddhism and Science* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). That book is a successor to the same author's *Buddhist Essays*, and is translated into English by the same translator, the Bhikkhu Silācāra. It is a volume which once more makes manifest how thoroughly Dr. Dahlke has studied Buddhism, and more than ever how thoroughly he is in sympathy with it as a religion. Sympathy is necessary to any fruitful exposition of a religion, more necessary in the case of Buddhism than any other religion, except Christianity. But Dr. Paul Dahlke is more than sympathetic. He believes in Buddhism with heart and soul. It is a striking fact, however, that his belief is the belief of a philosopher rather than of a devotee. After all that is what Buddhism is; it is a philosophy of life, and a sad one at that, without God and without hope.

Any devout scholar who studies St. Mark for himself may furnish a new commentary upon that much commented on book of Scripture and compel us to use it. Such a devout scholar and inde-



pendent expositor is the Rev. Charles Knapp, D.D., Junior Chaplain of Merton College, Oxford. His Commentary on *St. Mark* is published as one of Messrs. Murby's 'Larger Scripture Manuals' (1s. 6d.). Every word likely to be misunderstood by the pupil is explained, and it is never explained as an isolated word but in relation to its context and associations. To set the pupil in the atmosphere of the Second Gospel is the editor's chief aim. For this purpose the introduction is unusually full and well adapted to awaken the historical imagination.

In the year 1908 Mr. F. C. Norton published a book on Assyriology, regarding which Professor Hogg of Manchester said: 'Mr. Norton's book is an attempt to supply an elementary and popular alphabetically arranged work of reference, where the beginner can learn something about Assyriology. The idea is excellent, and any one who frankly knows nothing about the subject will find in it hints that will help him; but the book needs overhauling.'

Mr. Norton has now 'overhauled' the book and issued it under the title: *Bible Student's Handbook of Assyriology* (Kegan Paul; 3s. 6d. net). The new title is scarcely comprehensive enough; there is information here which even the professional Assyriologist will find useful. On questions in dispute such as Babylonian monotheism Mr. Norton is cautious; but he is quite sure that the Hebrew narratives of the Creation were ultimately derived from Babylonia, and were not inherited independently by the Babylonians and Hebrews from a common Semitic ancestor.

After the article on the 'Babis' in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, the best account of Babism or Behaism is to be found in a volume with the title of *Abbas Effendi: His Life and Teaching*, to which Professor Browne of Cambridge, the author of the *Encyclopædia* article, has contributed a long introduction (Putnam's; 6s. net). The author of the book is Mr. Myron H. Phelps of the New York Bar. Mr. Phelps is unacquainted with any language spoken by Effendi, but so well did he catch the meaning of the conversations which he had through an interpreter that in reading the book Professor Browne hears the very tones of Abbas Effendi's voice.

This is the second edition. The author has revised his book throughout and omitted one

part, as some doubt had been thrown on its accuracy.

In a book with the title of *The Law of Psychic Phenomena* (Putnam's; 6s.), Mr. Thomson Jay Hudson has covered the whole ground of Hypnotism, Spiritism, Mental Therapeutics, and the like, and has told us accurately and authoritatively how these studies stand at the present moment. We say authoritatively. The authority is not official; it is that of the man who has investigated with care and without prejudice. And the conclusion that he has come to, in respect of spirit-rapping for example, is that the fact cannot be denied, but that it proves nothing whatever about the life to come. Three propositions account for the phenomena: (1) the mind of man is dual in its nature—objective and subjective; (2) the subjective mind is constantly controlled by suggestion; and (3) the subjective mind possesses physical power, that is, the power to make itself heard and felt, and to move ponderable objects.

Towards the end of his book Mr. Hudson grapples directly with the problem of immortality. His conclusions are this time stated in two propositions: 'The first proposition of my theory is that the death, or practical extinction, of the soul as a conscious entity is the necessary result of unbelief in immortality. The second proposition is that the soul, having attained immortality through belief, is then subject to the law of rewards and punishments "according to the deeds done in the body." The same propositions are more sentimentiously expressed in Ro 2<sup>12</sup>: "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." In other words, the condition precedent to the attainment of immortality, or salvation,—that is, the saving of the soul from death,—is *belief*. The condition precedent to the attainment of eternal bliss and the avoidance of the punishments incident to sin, is righteousness.'

Mr. William Reeves, the publisher, beyond all other publishers, of the literature of music, has issued a translation of the *Life of Chopin*, by Franz Liszt (6s.). He had already issued a translation of part of the book; but now he has discarded that partial work and published this, a complete and competent translation, in its stead. A medallion portrait of Chopin is given as frontispiece.

The book is as characteristic of Liszt as it is a characterization of Chopin. 'In Chopin's relations and intercourse with others, it was what interested them which always seemed to occupy him; he took care never to draw them away from the sphere of their own personality lest they should intrude upon his. He gave up to others but little of his time; yet that little was devoted to them unreservedly. None ever asked him for an account of his dreams, his hopes, his wishes; none seemed to desire to know what he sighed for or what he might have conquered if his white and tapering fingers had found it possible to link the brazen chords of life to the golden wires of his enchanted lyre! In his presence none had leisure to think of these things. He rarely conversed on topics of any deep interest, but glided lightly over all subjects; and as he gave little time to conversation, that little was easily filled up with the details of the day. He took care never to allow his talk to wander into digressions of which he might himself be the subject. His individuality rarely excited the investigations of curiosity or evoked close scrutiny; he pleased too much to awaken much reflection. The combined effect of his personality was harmonious, and did not call for any special comment. His blue eyes were more spiritual than dreamy, and his bland smile never writhed into bitterness. The transparent delicacy of his complexion pleased the eye, his fair hair was soft and silky, and his nose slightly aquiline; and his bearing was so distinguished and his manners were stamped with so much high breeding, that he was involuntarily always treated *en prince*. His gestures were numerous and full of grace; his voice was in tone somewhat veiled, often stifled; he was of low stature, and his limbs were but slight. He always put us in mind of a convolvulus balancing its azure-hued cup upon a very slight stem, the tissue of which is so vaporous that the slightest contact wounds and tears the delicate corolla.'

The second volume of Mr. Meyer's devotional Commentary on *Exodus* is out. It is, as some of the volumes of the series are not, truly devotional; it is also as expository as any of the volumes (Religious Tract Society; 2s.).

Canon R. L. Ottley has undertaken to write three volumes for Mr. Robert Scott's 'Library of Historic Theology'—one on the Creed, one on the

Commandments, and one on the Lord's Prayer. He has already published the volume on the Creed under the title of *The Rule of Faith and Hope*. He has now published the volume on the Ten Commandments under the title of *The Rule of Life and Love* (5s. net). The third volume, to be called 'The Rule of Work and Worship,' is yet to come.

This volume on the Decalogue is a scholar's exposition. Canon Ottley is not oblivious of the life that men and women are living around him, but he is not possessed as a social reformer with the tragedy of that life. He expounds the commandments, first as they were understood by the ancient Israelites, next as they were interpreted by Christ, and then as we ought to understand and obey them now. The volume will prove a fine useful quarry for the preacher.

Messrs. Elliot Stock have added two volumes to their attractive purple series of devotional books. Both deal with the things beyond. The title of the one is *There is no Death*, and the author is Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce (1s. 6d. net). The other is entitled *Them which Sleep in Jesus*; its author is the Rev. G. T. Shettle, L.A. (1s. 6d. net).

Mr. Arthur H. Stockwell has now published two volumes of *The Weekly Pulpit* (4s. 6d. net each). They contain the issues for the whole of 1912. Among the authors of sermons in the second volume (we have already noticed the first) are Dr. Clifford, the Rev. J. D. Jones, the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, Professor James Denney, and the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse. Then there are many outlines and hints for the preacher and the Bible teacher in every issue. Perhaps the editor might in future give us a list of the texts dealt with in each volume, and a list of the contributors.

Mr. Stockwell has also published the first volume of a series to be entitled *The Great Things of God* (3s. 6d. net). This volume has been written by the Rev. S. M. Johnston, B.A., D.Sc. The sermons it contains are short, being shorn of all unnecessary language. The texts are taken from every part of the Bible and introduce every variety of sermon.

The same publisher has issued three smaller volumes of sermons—*Visions in the Vale*, by the Rev. A. Bertram Pratt, M.A. (2s. net); *The Secret*



of *Serenity*, by the Rev. David Wallace (2s. net); and *Walking with God*, by the Rev. David Purves, M.A., D.D. (2s. 6d. net). They are all well worth their money. Perhaps Dr. Purves has the advantage in style, but he cannot surpass the other men in earnestness or in vivid presentation of the gospel.

Two still smaller and cheaper volumes from the same publishing house are *Via Crucis*, by the Rev. J. Macartney Wilson, B.D.; and *True Manhood*, by the Rev. F. C. M. Buck, A.T.S. (1s. net). Last of all and most acceptable comes a volume of children's sermons by the Rev. A. E. Johns, entitled *Little Words for Little Worshippers* (1s. 6d. net).

## The Messianic Interpretation of Prophecy.

By THE REV. F. H. WOODS, B.D., LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?  
--MATT. xi. 3.

FROM our present Christian point of view, this question seems at first sight a very simple one, and the answer obvious. 'Yes, of course,' we are inclined to say, and what we mean is something of this sort: 'The Carpenter of Nazareth was in fact He that was destined to come, and whose coming was foretold by the Jewish prophets.' If we were further asked whether Christ corresponded to these prophecies as the Jews of our Lord's Day understood them, we might be disposed to answer, 'No, they understood them to refer to a literal and temporal kingdom, but their real reference is to the spiritual Kingdom of which He was speaking when He said, "My kingdom is not of this world" (Jn 18<sup>36</sup>).' The first statement is certainly true as regards the expectation of many, perhaps most, of the simple-minded and uncultured people of our Lord's Day. The question which is said to have been asked shortly before the Ascension, 'Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' (Ac 1<sup>6</sup>), seems to show that some at least of the apostles shared this opinion. With this we may compare the difficulty felt by the disciples on the road to Emmaus. 'We hoped that it was he which should redeem Israel?' (Lk 24<sup>21</sup>). But the second statement, that our Lord's contemporaries misunderstood what the Prophets meant, is at least open to question, if we ought not indeed to say that it is certainly wrong. For surely it is most reasonable to suppose that a writer means precisely what he says, unless we have some very definite reason to believe the contrary. Of course, there would be such a reason, if there were any hint that the Prophets were speaking in parables.

It might be said that this appears to be the case with the vision of Ezekiel's temple, where, in spite of the matter-of-fact description, some of the details are so extravagant as to be practically impossible, and where what is apparently material passes altogether into the mystical and symbolic when the prophet describes the streams of water which flowed out from beside the altar. Again, we have in Is 11 a beautiful symbolic picture of the Messianic age when the cow and the bear are to feed, and their young ones lie down together, and the lion to eat straw like the ox. This follows, it may be pointed out, immediately upon the description of the Messianic King. But in such a case there is no ground for believing that the figure of a king is consciously used as a symbol of one far higher than an earthly king. It is one thing to use earthly figures to represent spiritual and heavenly things, quite another to use unnatural figures to express features which may, after all, have only an earthly meaning.

There is no reason, therefore, to suppose from this passage that Isaiah contemplated a super-human Messiah. It is true, of course, that the Shoot from the stock of Jesse is to be endowed in a supernatural degree with the highest faculties. But these faculties do not belong to Him in His own Being, but are the special endowment of the Holy Spirit, and are just the particular faculties necessary for executing what was a specially kingly duty, the hearing of causes. It is also a significant fact that the prophecy of the Messianic King is immediately followed by the prediction of such temporary events under his auspices as the union of the northern and southern kingdoms, and a successful attack on their surrounding enemies.

It may be said, indeed, that such passages were

believed by early Christians to have been fulfilled by Jesus of Nazareth. The first Gospel, for example, evidently refers to the name 'Branch' of this prophecy in the words, 'He shall be called a Nazarene' (Mt 2<sup>23</sup>). The same prophecy is also definitely referred to Jesus by St. Paul, 'There shall be the root of Jesse, and he that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; on him shall the Gentiles hope' (Ro 15<sup>12</sup>; cf. Is 11<sup>10</sup>). And there can be little doubt that our Lord had such passages definitely in view when He said that He came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil (Mt 5<sup>17</sup>). But in what sense did He claim that he fulfilled the Prophets? By fulfilling the Law, He did not mean that he was re-enacting the Decalogue as it stood, but, as He Himself explained in detail, that the Law of the Gospel was to be an enrichment of the Decalogue, forbidding all infringements of its spirit in deed, word, or even in thought and feeling. But if so, are we not justified in explaining the fulfilment of the Prophets in an analogous sense? It is surely no more necessary to suppose that the Prophets meant by their predictions the Christ as He actually proved to be than that the early Legislator intended by the Decalogue to forbid angry feelings or impurity of thought. When Christ claimed to be the expected King, He was using no mere metaphor. He summed up in Himself the three chief functions of royalty. He came to be our Law-giver, our Master, and our Judge. Thus understood, we are justified in saying with St. Augustine, both as regards the Law and the Prophets, that the New Testament was latent in the Old, that the Old became patent in the New (Aug., *Quest. in Ex.*, lib. ii. Quæst. lxxviii.).

I should perhaps add that it does not follow that all references of prophetic and other passages to Christ and Christian events in the New Testament are justifiable. Having quite legitimately once seen Christ foreshadowed in the Old Testament, the early Christian writers were tempted to find Him everywhere. *E.g.* the words, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son,' in Hos 11<sup>1</sup>, refer obviously to the nation called out of Egypt, and cannot legitimately be pressed, as it is in the first Gospel (Mt 2<sup>15</sup>), into the service of Christology. Again, even where a passage is certainly Messianic, it does not follow that the exegesis of details given by a New Testament writer is necessarily satisfactory. The Messianic name 'Branch' was

intended by Isaiah no doubt to mean that the Messiah would spring from the royal house of David. It might be regarded as fulfilled in a sense in the genealogy of Jesus; but it is a mere play on words to interpret it of His having been brought up at Nazareth (see Mt 2<sup>23</sup>).

It would be beyond the scope of this inquiry to consider the passages of the Old Testament bearing on what is called 'the Suffering Messiah,' because it is very obvious that this did not form part of the Messianic expectation in our Lord's Day (see Lk 24<sup>21, 26</sup>, Ac 8<sup>32-34</sup>). The Cross was, in fact, the great stumbling-block in the way of the Jews accepting Jesus as the Christ (1 Co 1<sup>23</sup>). But this much may be said, that if such passages are to be explained as Messianic we are justified in requiring some sort of analogy between the Old Testament sufferer (whether an individual or the nation) and Jesus of Nazareth.

So far we have been dealing with what was in the main the more popular conception of the Messiah, a mighty King who would overcome all their enemies, and rid them from the detested power of Rome, establish peace in the world, and rule over them in perfect justice. To some extent they probably realized also the other side of the picture, the perfect people as well as the perfect King. It was such expectations that made them so anxious to proclaim Jesus as their King, and that explain also their utter disappointment when He refused their claim.

But there was another view of the expected Messiah in our Lord's Day, which may be called that of the comparatively learned. This expression must, however, be regarded as including all those who were conversant with the current religious literature of the age, and it would appear to embrace a very large circle. The literature I refer to is not contained, with two exceptions (Daniel and 2 Esdras), either in the Old Testament or in the Apocrypha, but in a body of writings commonly known as Pseudepigraphic or Apocalyptic. They were most of them written either during the lifetime or in the century before the time of our Saviour, and even when shortly after His time they fairly represent Jewish religious opinion as current in His day. Differing as they do in details and in standpoint, they commonly agree in the following particulars: They are written in the name of some Old Testament character—Enoch, Isaiah, Baruch, or the like,—in



whose mouth certain prophecies are put which, in point of fact, are events which have already taken place. The pseudonymous writer is also represented as foretelling other events of a more mystical and supernatural character which are yet to come to pass. Among these still future events is the Advent of the Messiah who is no longer a human King, but one who comes from heaven to judge the nations of the world and rule for ever over God's people. The earliest book of this class of literature, and one of which the others are more or less copies, is Daniel. That this book was written in the early part of the Maccabean struggle is evident from the fact that the writer describes in the pseudo-prophecies of Daniel, historical events up to the year 167 B.C., and afterwards gives very vague predictions concerning the last acts and fate of Antiochus Epiphanes which differ considerably from the facts.<sup>1</sup> Further, while the historical references during the supposed history of Daniel are full of inaccuracies, the history of the Seleucid dynasty, as the events approach the time of the Maccabean revolt, is given in accurate detail. The object of the book is evidently to console the Maccabees and their supporters, and to urge them on to deeds of fortitude and faith. With this object in view the writer relates wonderful stories in which the faith and courage of Daniel and his companions had been abundantly vindicated. On the other hand, in the fate that had befallen heathen tyrants for their blasphemies and desecrations, he foresees the fate of that arch-blasphemer and desecrator Antiochus. In the madness of Nebuchadnezzar we have very probably a foreshadowing of an Epiphanes converted into an Epimanes. The writer goes on to relate a number of visions in which under symbolic figures events are described by the interpreting angel which point to the great truth that all nations are in the hand of God; that as one nation after another had fallen, so the last and most terrible would collapse, and that then the Kingdom of the Messiah would rise upon its ruins. It may seem difficult to us, from our modern point of view, to justify this book, and others of its class. It would, however, be extremely unfair to compare it to such a modern forgery as *Ossian's Poems* by Macpherson, for it cannot really be proved that the writer ever intended to pass off the work as Daniel's, any more than the writer of *Koheleth* or *Wisdom*

<sup>1</sup> See esp. Dn 11<sup>36-45</sup>.

seriously supposed that these books would be accepted as genuine works of Solomon. In fact, the common practice of writing pseudepigraphic literature at the time shows how very transparent was this purely literary device. On the other hand, of the great beauty and religious value of the Book of Daniel it seems almost impertinent to speak. It is, however, the Messianic picture as portrayed in this and other Apocalyptic books that now concerns us.

The most important vision for our purpose is that of Dn 7. After the description of the world powers ending with the fourth (*i.e.* the Seleucid) dynasty, and the little horn (*i.e.* Ant. Epiphanes) that had the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things, there follows the splendid scene of the Great Assize in which Jehovah is seen seated upon His Throne in all the Majesty of Divine glory, attended by thousands and thousands of His ministers. The judgment is set and the books are opened. The writer passes on to the execution of the sentence upon all the peoples of the world, but especially upon the little horn. A third scene opens with the coming on the clouds of heaven of one like a Son of Man, who is brought near to Jehovah's Throne and receives from Him an everlasting Kingdom over all peoples, nations, and tongues.

It will be observed that this picture differs from the earlier representations of the Messiah, not only in His apparently superhuman character, but also in the fact that He is not Himself the executor of the sentence upon Israel's enemies, but only appears after it has been carried out.

It might be suggested, on the contrary, that in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in chap. 2 the stone (vv.<sup>34, 45</sup>) which breaks in pieces the powers of the world is intended to represent the Messiah. That this is not the case is clear, however, from v.<sup>35</sup>, where the stone becomes a great mountain. The stone, therefore, must be explained as being in some sense or other the nation itself.

A later vision speaks of a period of trouble, which is to precede a general Resurrection in which the wise are to shine as stars in everlasting glory. It is not very easy to see exactly how this prediction is related to the earlier, but it is natural to suppose that the troubles are to precede and the Resurrection to follow the Advent of the Messiah.

The dignified but glorious representation of the

Messiah's advent in Daniel could not be surpassed by later Apocalyptic writers, but it was amplified in many details. One very striking additional feature is the full description of the convulsions of nature and of the social order which would precede or attend His Advent. Thus we read in the Assumption of Moses (10<sup>1-10</sup>): 'Then shall the earth quake, and it shall be shaken unto the ends thereof, and the high mountains shall be brought low and shall be shaken, and the valleys shall sink down. The sun shall no more give his light, and shall be turned into darkness. The horns of the moon shall be broken, and shall be wholly turned into blood. And the course of the stars shall be brought into confusion. The sea shall withdraw into the abyss, and the wells shall cease, and the rivers dry up.'<sup>1</sup> In the Book of Jubilees we read (23<sup>12</sup>): 'In those days there will be plague upon plague, wound upon wound, sadness upon sadness, evil rumour upon evil rumour, and many similar terrible punishments, one after another; sickness, destruction, frost, hail, snow, fever, cold, stiffness, drought, death, sword, imprisonment, and every kind of sorrow and sickness.'<sup>2</sup> Again, the Advent is described as attended by thousands of angels, as in Enoch 1<sup>9</sup>, a passage familiar to us from its quotation in the Epistle of Jude (v.<sup>14</sup>), 'And behold He cometh with ten thousands of His Holy ones, to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all the ungodly and to convict all flesh,' etc.<sup>3</sup> It need hardly be said that the Apocalyptic writers did not derive such additional features from their own imagination. Passages which speak of great natural disorders as either figuring or attending Divine judgments are common throughout the Prophets.<sup>4</sup> It will be sufficient for my purpose to quote Joel 2<sup>30, 31</sup>: 'I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the LORD come.' Here the context in 3<sup>2, 3</sup> readily lends itself to an eschatological interpretation. Indeed, the thought that all nations would be gathered together to fight against Israel and meet with a final overthrow is a conception met with more than

once in the later prophets, as we may see from Ezekiel's description of the fate of Gog in the land of Magog (38. 39), the destruction of Jehovah's enemies outside Jerusalem in Is 66<sup>19, 24</sup>, Zec 14, and from other passages. The attendance of the Holy ones may have been suggested by the opening words of the Blessings of Moses (Dt 33<sup>2</sup>), where, according to LXX,<sup>5</sup> Jehovah is said to have come with the ten thousands of Holy ones, and His angels at His right hand. But what was new in the Apocalyptic writers was the way in which they connected these thoughts so as to form a complete cycle of events which were to occur in the Last Days.

The later Apocalypses usually follow Daniel in describing Jehovah Himself as both the Judge and apparently the executor of the sentence against the adversaries; but occasionally both these functions are ascribed to the Messiah. Thus in the Sibylline Oracles (iii. 55) we read, 'And then will God send a king from heaven to judge each one with blood and the glow of fire';<sup>6</sup> and in the Book of Enoch (lxii. 2) it is said that 'the Lord of Spirits seated him on the throne of his glory, and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him, and the word of his mouth slew all the sinners, and all the unrighteous were destroyed before his face,' with which we may compare lxix. 29, etc. etc.

The resemblance between such passages from the Apocalyptic writings and our Lord's eschatological discourses is obviously too close to be explained by saying that they are independent compilations of the same Old Testament prophecies. There is certainly a direct connexion between the two. How, then, should we explain this? It has been maintained that the narration of their discourses has been largely, perhaps unconsciously, coloured by the current Messianic views of the age, as we find the latter in the Apocalyptic writers. Indeed, one scholar<sup>7</sup> (whose theological studies in Oxford have justly won him very high regard) goes so far as to propose that we should regard what he calls the Apocalypse of St. Mark (13<sup>5-37</sup>) as originally a quite independent document inserted into the primitive Gospel. He suggests that in this document the writer attributes the

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Oesterley's *Doctrine of the Last Things*, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> See Oesterley, *op. cit.* p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> The quotations from Enoch are taken from Charles's second edition, 1912.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. references in Oesterley, p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> The Heb. of the last clause is quite unintelligible, and the text is probably corrupt.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.* p. 89.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. B. H. Streeter in Sanday's *Studies in Synoptic Problems*, pp. 179-183.



speculations of His age to Christ in the same spirit in which the earlier Apocalyptic writers attributed theirs to Daniel, Enoch, and others, that it was written just after the fall of Jerusalem; that its chief objects were to warn his readers against Antichrist and to console them with the assurance on the Master's own authority that the fall of Jerusalem was the immediate prelude to His coming. It might be objected that such a method of criticism would soon leave us with very little to criticise. But it would be more pertinent to observe that the analogy to the Apocalypses breaks down on one very essential point. They were all written in the name of an ancient Jew, and their being so ascribed would have deceived nobody. But to have put a long discourse into the mouth of Christ only forty years after His death would have been nothing more or less than a deliberate and wanton forgery. On the other hand, the possibility of our Lord's language, even in the Synoptists, having been influenced by current opinion during a period of oral transmission is not one to be lightly dismissed. Indeed, we seem to have in St. Luke a clear instance of a somewhat similar colouring by recent events of the actual eschatological discourses in question, where he paraphrases the very difficult phrase (Mk 13<sup>14</sup>), 'When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not,' with the words, 'When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand' (Lk 21<sup>20</sup>). But when we have made all allowance for such an influence, there still seems to be little doubt that our Lord in the main accepted the Apocalyptic predictions of the Messiah quite as much as those of the Prophets, and expected to fulfil them in His own person. Does it follow that as loyal Christians we are bound to accept as literally to be accomplished all that He said of His Second Advent? I think not. Here, again, two alternatives present themselves. In the first place, we may naturally ask whether the knowledge of these future events might not have belonged to those Divine attributes of which the Son of God emptied Himself (Ph 2<sup>7</sup>) when He became man. And this may seem all the more probable when we consider that it was expressly in connexion with a fact belonging to His Second Advent that He disclaimed such knowledge (see Mk 13<sup>32</sup>, and parallels); and further, that He seems certainly to have held the opinion

current in the early Church that His Advent would take place in the lifetime of some of His apostles. 'Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power' (Mk 9<sup>1</sup>).

But this is not the only possible explanation of our Lord's language. It is by no means improbable that He accepted these utterances of Apocalyptic writers, just in the same spirit that He accepted the predictions of the Prophets, not so much in their literal acceptation, but as more or less allegorical. I mean that He foretold a personal return to the world, but that the details were little more than the scenery in which that thought was represented. It is obvious that the Synoptists, at any rate, recognized a partial fulfilment of our Lord's eschatological discourses in the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. In the Fourth Gospel an Advent of Christ is recognized in the coming of the Holy Spirit, who thereby establishes the kingdom that is not of this world. But in both the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics a more perfect realization of the Kingdom is to be found at the general resurrection when the King returns to the world (see Mt 13<sup>30-49</sup> 25<sup>31</sup>, Mk 8<sup>38</sup>, Jn 21<sup>22</sup>).

In conclusion, I would observe that it would be a very serious mistake to regard such discussions as these as having merely an academic interest. As Christians we look forward in hope to share after this life the Kingdom of Christ in glory. Yet let us not forget that, after all, the greater stress was laid by our Lord on His Kingdom upon earth. But King and Kingdom, as I said before, are far from being mere metaphors. If Christ is our King, we as His subjects owe Him whole-hearted obedience. If the Church on earth is in any real sense the Kingdom of God, and we are fellow-citizens with the saints, then to us oppression and injustice, not to mention selfish indolence, must be absolutely intolerable. We cannot look on with equanimity at cruelties sometimes practised in the name of civilization, at the white slave traffic, at sweating, and the like, and must sigh and pray for the time when war shall be no more. We shall do our very utmost as loyal citizens to bring about the time when the Kingdom of this world shall become the Kingdom of our God and His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever. Amen.

## In the Study.

### An Ordination Service.

BY THE REV. JAMES DONALD, D.D., KEITHHALL.

#### Ordination Prayer

(Following the singing of the hymn, 'Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire').

OUR souls do magnify the Lord, and our spirits have rejoiced in God our Saviour: for He that is mighty hath done to us great things, and holy is His name. We praise Thee, O God, that Thou dost enable us to look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities, to see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down, whereof the stakes shall never be removed, nor the cords be broken. But there the glorious Lord will be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams, wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our King: He will save us.

God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, we thank Thee that Thou hast in these last days spoken unto us by Thy Son, who being the brightness of Thy glory and express image of Thy Person, and upholding all things by the Word of His power, when He had by Himself made purification of our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high: and we believe that there is none other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved, but the name of Jesus, the Son of the Living God.

Holy Jesus, who for the suffering of death art crowned with glory and honour, we thank Thee that, as the Risen Lord, Thou didst command Thy disciples to go and make disciples of all the nations, and didst assure them of Thy perpetual presence unto the end of the world; and that, as the Ascended Lord, Thou didst endow them with the manifold gifts and graces of Thy Spirit, and gavest some to be apostles, and some to be prophets, and some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of Thy body, the Church. Blessed be Thou who daily bearest the burden of our spiritual charge, Thou God of our salvation. Thou art the Bread that strengtheneth us, the Wine that maketh

our heart glad, the Vine in whom we abide, the Life of whose fulness we receive, the Good Shepherd who restoreth our souls.

Thee also, Holy Spirit, Spirit of our Father, Spirit of Jesus, we confess and adore as our Advocate and Comforter, the Guardian and Guide of our understanding, our affections, and our will. Breathe on us, Thou Breath of God: fill us with the Life in Christ.

Blessed and glorious Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, accept our thanksgivings and prayers; and confirm and ratify our act, as we do now ordain this man a Presbyter in Thy Church and a Minister of Thy Word and Sacraments, by the laying on of hands. Abba, Father, send forth the Spirit of Thy Son into his heart, take and use him as a willing instrument of Thy purpose of love. Jesus, make him a faithful preacher of Thy cross and resurrection, an able expositor of those holy Scriptures which testify of Thee. Holy Spirit, anoint him with the oil of gladness, and rest upon him with Thy sevenfold gifts for this service.

May he take heed unto himself, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made him overseer, to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood. For Zion's sake may he not hold his peace, and for Jerusalem's sake may he not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. May he fight the good fight of faith, and be of them that turn back the battle to the gate. May he discern the presence of the King in the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the stranger, visit Him in the sick, receive Him in every humble disciple. May he honour them that fear the Lord, turn many to righteousness, be a guide to the young and a staff to the aged, may he solace the bereaved and the desolate, lift up the head that is bowed down, and turn to the sacrifice of Christ the dying eyes. May he have the girt loin and the lit lamp of the alert servant. May he not count his life dear unto himself, so that he may finish his course with joy; and having kept the faith, may he receive the crown of righteousness, which the Lord will give unto all them that love His appearing. These things we ask of Thee, O Father, pleading the merits of Thy Son, Jesus



Christ the righteous, unto whom with Thee and the Holy Spirit be glory for ever. Amen.

#### Ordination Addresses.

##### I.

Dear Brother: There is a well-known hymn of Doddridge's, beginning with the words, 'O happy day, that *fixed* my choice on Thee, my Saviour and my God.' The speaker is the Christian believer; but this day you can take the lines into your mouth with a new-born emotion as the Christian minister, adding the words, *And on Thy service*. 'O God, my heart is fixed,' exclaims the Psalmist, 'I will sing and give praise, even with my glory,' that is, with my soul, the image and the instrument of the Divine Glory. And it is written in another Psalm, 'His heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.' Fixed and steadfast in trust,—fixed and steadfast in praise and in personal consecration to the service of your Saviour and your God,—these are the main elements of the happiness of the day of your ordination. Other and secondary causes of happiness are present, and by the good providence of God they are abundant,—the call you have received, the universal goodwill, the pleasant district where your home is to be; but all these are tributaries of the main stream, 'I will go to the altar of God, unto God my exceeding Joy.' Your call to this parish is of God; it is He who has granted you favour in the sight of this people, who has appointed the sphere of your work to be among them; and He has done all this with a definite end in view, that you should '*serve with your spirit* in the gospel of His Son.' This means your devoting to this service the enthusiasm and energy of your innermost being. You are '*separated unto the gospel of God*.' While these words express St. Paul's consciousness of the special qualifications he has received for his Apostolic ministry by means of his early training at Tarsus and in Jerusalem, they above all signify that he is 'a chosen vessel unto Jesus, to bear His name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel.' In like manner, my brother, your early home training, and the direction of your thoughts to the Christian ministry, as well as your University training, and that which followed it under an honoured successor of Norman Macleod, were all of them providential preparations for the work

unto which you are now ordained; but it is the election of God, and of Christ the Head of the kingdom of God, that has '*separated*' you, and made you '*a chosen vessel*' to bear the name of Jesus before the people of this parish. '*Separate unto Me* Barnabas and Saul for the work unto which I have called them,' said the Holy Ghost by the mouth of one of the prophets, when the Church of Antioch had met to pray for guidance in the matter of the Gentile mission. And, in speaking thus, the Holy Spirit showed that He is the Church's Patron and Guide, who directs all her movements and ministries of grace. He is the Creator-Spirit, who with His Divine breath called the Church into being at Pentecost; and His command, '*separate unto Me*,' is also a promise, '*I will be with my servants in the work, will give them a mouth and wisdom, will accompany their preaching with My power, will take of the things of Jesus and show to them, that they may show those things to others, and will thus add unto the Church such as shall be saved*.' Enter, then, my brother, on your work, with this high assurance of the help of that Spirit, who is the Lord and Giver of the life in Christ.

As one now admitted to the charge of a parish, you may be suitably addressed under three aspects: as *the Leader of the Church's worship*; as *the Preacher*; and as *the Pastor of the flock*.

You have no doubt already felt, in your work as an assistant, the strain upon the mind and heart that is involved in the endeavour worthily to lead the Church's worship. To compose prayers of your own and commit them to memory is a safe course to follow, particularly in the first part of the service. But as the service goes on, and spiritual thoughts throng into the mind, one feels independent of written forms, or of the outlines he has drawn up, and is often able to give free expression to his desires and longings, and so to reach a higher level in prayer. This is not of ourselves; it is the gift of God. Those inspired moments when, through the communion and fellowship of the Holy Spirit, we really speak as children to their Father, touch the Unseen, and grasp with firmer hand, as well as uplift our fellow-worshippers to grasp, the Eternal Grace, are the celestial altitudes of public prayer, and tokens for good shown to us that we have not altogether failed in leading the Church's worship. Yet will the most rapt emotion be of little practical worth,

if the language be wanting, in which it may find seemly clothing: it is therefore necessary that the memory should be constantly replenished out of the stores of God's Word. Rich as ancient liturgical forms are, their richness is chiefly due to the felicitous use that they make of the words of Scripture. Seek, my brother, to have those words at your command; refresh your memory with them before entering the pulpit, and then you will be always well prepared.

Secondly, you can fulfil the Preacher's office effectively, only if you take St. Paul's principle, 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God,'—a principle already enunciated by our Lord in the Parable of the Sower,—and make it the fundamental principle of this part of your work. You are a minister of the Church of the Reformation, which has ever put the living Word in the place of pre-eminence among the means of grace. It is well to have a bright service, to make every part of it tasteful and attractive, to hear 'the pealing organ blow,' and the singing of 'the full-voiced choir'; but these are but pleasing and useful aids, and may even be hindrances, if the pulpit be set aside as of minor account, or if he who speaks from it be depending upon them rather than upon his own assiduous preparation. Ritual is but a usurper, if it dethrone the pulpit. The place where I now stand belongs to you, and in it you will plead for your Lord, and bear witness to His perfections as the Man and the Redeemer. Here you will exhort your hearers to be like Him, to live the moral life in His spirit; for it is of no use telling people about their moral duties, unless those duties are based upon Christ. And here you will dispense to all who come, parents and children,—for the Visible Church includes *both*,—that Living Bread whereby the life of the individual Christian is developed and its strength renewed. Apply your mind diligently to the study and exposition of Scripture, and your preaching will be fresh and stimulating for forty or fifty years to come. A happy experience which sometimes comes to us preachers is this: there are seasons when our text has not to be searched for, but comes to us, as it were, of its own accord,—when we are 'pressed in the spirit' or 'by the Word' to take a certain line in the exposition of Divine truth. This is an encouraging sign that God is using us as His instruments for communicating the know-

ledge of His Will, or purpose of Love. But freshness in preaching will never be wanting, if the preacher looks forward with resolution to the Lord's Day, which always comes round so quickly, and reminds himself, 'Nothing is so important for me as my pulpit work.' You will find too, my brother, that your girding yourself for this work will speed your own running—your 'pressing toward the mark.'

Thirdly, use well, and persevere in using, your splendid opportunities for pastoral faithfulness. Not the parish church, but the parish, is the Sheepfold; and the work of feeding and tending has to be gone about in the homes of your people. Your learning to apply God's remedy for sin by acquiring the knowledge of their needs, is no less essential than your proclaiming it from the pulpit. You are not new to visiting work, having been assistant in a great city parish. But you are now a man in authority, as well as 'a man under authority'; you feel a new sense of independence as you survey from this spot the field of labour; and while, with reason, you glory in the prospect, you also realize the responsibility. The responsibility, then, is to be met by thoughtfulness or considerateness,—by your 'considering' others, and thinking hard how you may employ your time so as to profit them. We, ministers, are the officials of a King, who made Himself the humble attendant upon the hungry and the sad and the weak, and who calls us to be 'the servants of all.' Find, then, my brother, in the service of the young, in ministering to the sick and the bereaved, in that breaking of the bread of life 'from house to house' which may be looked at as a continuation of His miracle of multiplying the loaves, many lines to lead you into the road whereon He walked. Yourself young, you will have great influence with the young, of whom many, it may be in distant lands, will hereafter bless your name. It is also a solemn reflexion that among the older members of your flock now present, there may be some into whose dying ears you will have before many years are passed to repeat your Saviour's words of consolation, bidding them 'not be troubled, nor afraid.' By your visiting, you will gain your people's confidence; and sometimes you will find evidences of personal religion and a patient trust in Christ, that will make your heart cheerful, as you wend your way homeward. When people see you intent upon really knowing them,



they will appreciate your work more. You will be something higher than the popular minister; you will be 'the approved Christian.' To have the approval of those under whose observation you live is one of 'the things that accompany salvation.' 'Be ambitious,' then, in St. Paul's sense of the word, both to be well-pleasing to your Lord, and to be well-pleasing to men, 'not seeking your own profit, but the profit of the many, that they may be saved.' Learn by unselfish service that 'it is more blessed to give than to receive.' 'Strengthen that which is diseased, heal that which is sick, bind up that which is broken, bring again that which was driven away, seek that which was lost': so shall men take knowledge of you that, as a Pastor, you are walking in His spirit, who still carries on in glory His own work of 'the Great Shepherd of the sheep.'

Finally, my brother, 'be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might.' 'Endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.' You will have—all have—moments of dulness and depression. None of us can be perfect ministers, because none of us can be perfect men. It is well that we should be made to feel that we are but 'the earthen vessels,' in whom God is pleased to make known 'the excellency of His own power.' Live for your parish: yea, rather, live unto your Lord, in all the blessed activities of a love resembling His: what higher hope have we of heaven, than that of being thus engaged? May the happiness of this day, the good wishes of your presbytery, the esteem and high hopes of your friends, the hearty welcome of a united people, be foretokenings of your Saviour's final approval, and of His hereafter crowning your name with glory, honour, and immortality! Amen.

## II.

Dear Brethren and Friends: You have witnessed this day a solemn event in your history, and an act such as few of you have witnessed before, in the setting apart of Mr. MacNicol as your minister. Of this act you have not been merely spectators: you have had an active share in it yourselves. You are not to think that it is in consequence of our possessing any special virtue that we, the ministers present, have laid our hands upon the head of Mr. MacNicol: we have done so at your behest, and because of your choice and call to him to be your minister. We believe that

we have fulfilled our part by the authority and in harmony with the mind of the Holy Spirit,—for it was He who moved the early Christian Church to take over the ceremony of 'the laying on of hands' from the Old Testament Church as 'the familiar and expressive sign of benediction or blessing.' *Our* act of blessing, then, has been accompanied with your approval and consent, and you have ratified it by your prayers and intercessions. None of you, I am sure, has witnessed his ordination without saying, 'God bless him,' or bidding him God-speed. Let us consider, then, how you may give practical effect to your kind thoughts, and become a help and a support to him in his ministry.

In the first place, the edification and comfort of a service largely depend upon people's coming to it in a devotional frame of mind. It is an undoubted fact that there is in church a wonderful interchange of influence between minister and people. If warmth of heart, devout longings for communion with God, are present on the part of the congregation, the minister will be more fervent in spirit: coldness and formality, on the other hand, will depress him, and the temperature of worship will be sensibly lowered. A devotional frame of mind will not come at your call, but there are means of obtaining it. Remember your minister in your prayers at the throne of grace on the Sunday morning, and on entering church; also, if possible, read a Psalm, as the 84th, or a chapter in St. John, before starting from home. 'Receive us'—'open your hearts to us'—is an affectionate entreaty of St. Paul's to one of his churches; and I would apply it thus: 'In your prayers for those near your heart, make room for your minister.' The end which a congregation should have in view in worship is expressed by St. Luke in a single word, *with one accord*. Bright will your service be, if it can be truly said of you with your minister, 'They lifted up their voice to God with one accord.'

Secondly, as his hearers, your right to judge of the quality of your minister's preaching is not to be gainsaid; but it is a right which, to be exercised with justice, must ever be exercised in the element of love. To provide something fresh for the pulpit every Sunday is a laborious work, and large allowance should be made for him who is steadily engaged in it. A thing that will help to make his sermons good is people's coming to hear them. Irregularity in coming to church is often a

cause of ministers being judged hastily with respect to their preaching: for people, hearing them seldom, understand only in part, and miss the unity of thought. Give your young minister the gladness of seeing the faces of most of you who are present this day looking up to him as he enters the pulpit. To be a steady hearer is the appointed means of being 'not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work.' And 'that man shall be blessed in his deed,'—blessed in the constancy of both his hearing and doing.

Finally, the Voice of the Good Shepherd may be recognized in that of one of His under-shepherds, if the ear be open to hear it. Your taking your minister by the hand on leaving church to-day signifies your intention, as members of his flock, to fulfil your part of the covenant between him and you. Then, bear his burdens; be forbearing to his faults; and in the unreserve of family life, always speak of him with respect. Do not be impatient, if his many other duties prevent him from calling for you as often as you should like. If there be illness or any trouble, do not depend upon his hearing accidentally of it, but send him word; this will be true kindness. As a servant of God and a Christian minister, he is not one already made perfect, but one who is still in the making; and your interest in him and prayers for him, your friendly criticism no less than your active love, are among the things that will give his character and work their mature form. I will only add that I have a high opinion of his gifts, and am liking him already. I do think that he will be a comfort to you, and earnestly trust that he and you, now happily united, may have prosperous and peaceful times together.

LAUS DEO. AMEN.

### *Virginitus Puerisque.*

#### *Small Things.*

BY THE REV. A. F. TAYLOR, M.A., ST. CYRUS.

'He that contemns small things shall fall by little and little.'—Ecclus. 19<sup>1</sup>.

WHERE is my text? Well, you will find it in the Bible, and you will *not* find it in the Bible. You will not find it in the Bible which you generally use, but you will find it in a larger Bible used by many Christian people; for in that larger Bible

there are some books which come between the Old Testament and the New Testament, and my text is in one of these.

But the words of my text speak for themselves: 'He that contemns (or despises) small things shall fall by little and little.' The man who said that had discovered for himself that what people call little things are sometimes very important things, and that the man who thinks that 'little things' do not matter is making a very serious mistake.

It is a long time ago since this text was first written, and we know now that the man who wrote it was speaking far more truly than he knew. It is scarcely going too far to say that one of the greatest discoveries of the last fifty years has been that the little things are really the big things—not big in their size, but tremendously big in their importance. An earthquake that kills ten thousand people in a few minutes is a terribly big thing, isn't it? But there is a tiny animal (a bacillus, the doctors call it) which, though you cannot see it, kills its tens of thousands every year. It is a far more serious peril than the earthquake.

I think it was the great surgeon Sir Frederick Treves who was recently giving an address to the medical students of one of our Scottish Universities. He reminded them of the old story of how St. George killed a huge and terrible dragon, and then he held up before them a glass pencil on the end of which there was an invisible group of the little germs which give people the fatal disease of consumption. 'This,' he said, 'is the real dragon, far more cruel and far more destructive than that old dragon which dwelt in the marshes of Lydda, and you, gentlemen, you are the knights of St. George who have to slay this terrible monster.'

Yes, the little things are very important things, and so it is that he that despiseth small things shall fall by little and little.

*Don't despise small faults*, for small faults may do a deal of mischief. Isn't one ill-tempered girl at a picnic enough to spoil all the fun?

*Don't despise small sins*, for if small sins are neglected they will soon grow into big ones. Judas sold Jesus for thirty pieces of silver, but he seems to have begun by taking pennies out of the bag.

*Don't despise small duties*, for small duties faithfully done fit us for the great and noble duties of life. Find in the Bible for yourselves this text: 'Thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will make you ruler over many things.'



And then here is a lesson not for the children, but for fathers and mothers and the Church.

*Don't despise small people*, the Church that despises the small people, and neglects to care for them, 'shall fall little by little,' until there are no people left in it at all. Its candle shall go out.

#### April.

BY THE REV. ROBERT HARVIE, M.A., Earlston.

'I have set before thee an open door.'—Rev 3<sup>8</sup>.

I propose now to say a little to you boys and girls about the month of April. The name of the month comes from a Latin word which means 'to open,' and that is why I chose this text. When April comes round it is just as if God were saying to each of us, 'I have set before thee an open door.'

When we spoke of the month of January we took the text, 'I am the Door,' for January is the month of Janus, who was the Roman god of doors. And here we are again, only three months later, and the month is telling us that it is a door.

I wonder what that means for you and me?

January is the door of the year counting by months, but April is the door of the year counting by seasons. March is boisterous and cold as a rule, and we are not altogether sure if the winter is quite over; but April comes on, and we know that it is the door leading into better times and promising us warm sunshine and brighter days.

So we are now at Spring, which is the first season of the year. Winter is just like our night, for trees and flowers don't look as if they had any life at all.

But they are only resting, as we do in sleep, and then in Spring they waken up and begin to put on their garments of leaves.

In later months there are plenty of flowers, but not so many bloom in April; it is just the door leading into the garden of the year.

Doesn't it look as if God spoke to the leaves and flowers, telling them of the warmth and sunshine that was yet to come, and so they begin in this month to prepare to show themselves in all their beauty?

But God speaks also to the birds. When the

winter cold comes, they fly away to warmer climates and wait there till our Winter is over. Then God tells them that the time has come to return and let us hear their music. They do this in the mornings, reminding us of the brightness of the day and the freshness of the air outside. To the birds, as well as to the flowers, God speaks, and when He calls more of them back in April, He says to each, 'I have set before thee an open door.'

But the month has its message for you and me also. It is just the same as for these others. I once came across some things a man had written about April, and he said, 'I was born in April, and every year when it comes round I am born again into new delight at what it brings.'

We are all glad when Spring is here and we see everything bursting into life again.

It is in Spring that the farmers open up the soil and put the seed into the ground. It wouldn't do for them to wait till the very warm weather came to plant their seeds. If they did that, they could not expect a heavy crop at the time of harvest. Well, I think that when God gives us January, which is the door into a new year, and then April, the door into the year that begins with Spring, that is just His way of telling us that He wants us to begin and sow seed for Him. Jesus tells us that the seed He wants us to sow is the Word of God, *i.e.* the love we are taught in the Bible, and the ground where we sow it is our heart. He means that we are to read about Him, and learn what He says, and then we are to obey Him, to do what He did, and to be like Him.

But He says we must begin now if we are to have a full crop at harvest. If boys and girls are to grow up into good men and women, they must begin early to follow Jesus and to try to be like Him. And the harvest you will gather in will be all the good deeds you have done and the kind words you have spoken because you loved Jesus and tried to please Him.

The wise man said, 'Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth.' And the month of April says you are at the door of a new year. Is it not a splendid chance to begin now to prepare for that harvest?

## What were the Churches of Galatia?

BY SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY  
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

### VI.

XI. THE PRINCIPLE OF CLASSIFICATION BY PROVINCES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.—In the ante-Nicene period generally, and also in the Byzantine period, the congregations of the Universal Church were classified according to provinces, *i.e.* the political divisions of the Empire; and a change in the political classification altered the ecclesiastical connexion. That was the case in the fourth century, as the early Council lists show.<sup>1</sup> When did the custom begin? Theodore of Mopsuestia, in *Comm. on 1 Timothy* (Swete ed., ii. p. 121 f.), says that the provincial principle goes back to Apostolic times; and Harnack (*Verbreitung*, 2nd ed. i. p. 387: *Expansion*, ii. p. 96) agrees that Theodore was right in this (though wrong, or merely spinning a theory of his own, in some of the statements which he makes about early Church organization). As Harnack says, 'Paul's range of missionary activity was regulated by the provinces: Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, etc., were ever in his mind's eye. He prosecutes the great work of his collection by massing together the congregations of a single province, and the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians is addressed, as many scholars think, to a large number of the Asiatic communities. John writes to the churches of Asia.'<sup>2</sup> In a footnote Harnack mentions, as if it were contrary to the principle, that John includes Laodicea, which belongs to 'the neighbouring district of Phrygia'<sup>3</sup>; but in this he confuses between 'province' and 'district.' Laodicea was a city of the district Phrygia and province Asia. Paul and John ranked Colossæ and Laodicea as Asian, for Phrygia was part of the province Asia.

The fact that John and Paul reckoned Laodicea as an Asian congregation (so also the fact that Philippi was counted a Macedonian congregation

and Corinth an Achæan) proves that they both had in mind political, *i.e.* Roman, provinces. At a later time, after A.D. 295, Phrygia was made a province, and then Laodicea ceased to be reckoned an Asian church, and its bishops became metropolitan of the province Phrygia Prima. Peter also classified the congregations to which he wrote according to the political provinces in which they were situated (1 P 1<sup>1</sup>, and Hort *ad loc.*<sup>4</sup>).

Therefore the contributions of the congregations of Galatia (1 Co 15<sup>1</sup>, 2 Co 9<sup>1-5</sup>, Ac 20<sup>4</sup>) were subscribed by Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, along with any other churches in the province Galatia; and they were taken to Jerusalem by Timothy of Lystra and Gaius of Derbe.

Here emerges a question: Were there both North and South Galatian churches, all reckoned equally in the province? As Professor Val. Weber has pointed out, the churches of Galatia, to which Paul wrote his Epistle, must have formed a single well-marked group. They acted together; they were brought over to Christianity at the same time; they were subject to the same influences; and they were all on the point of seceding from the gospel of Paul together. This, as he says, is not consistent with the view (which has sometimes been maintained) that there were two groups of churches of Galatia—one in the southern part of the province, converted and organized during the first journey; the other group in the northern part towards Ancyra and Pessinus, formed during the second journey. Those two parts, north and south, are separate and distinct, not merely geographically and racially, but also in time of conversion, in type and nature, and in the influences which acted on them. Travellers crossing the one district from east to west would not and could not in ordinary circumstances visit the

<sup>1</sup> Basil of Cæsarea tried vainly to resist this custom, when Cappadocia was divided by Valens about 371. His protest that the Church of God should not be divided according to political changes could not be maintained.

<sup>2</sup> I quote Dr. Moffatt's translation.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Moffatt has inserted the words, 'district of,' which are not in the German. See the last footnote in § XI.

<sup>4</sup> Hort in his North-Galatian days has treated this matter conclusively. There is nothing further to afford standing-ground for an adversary. Those who cannot see the completeness of the case as stated by Hort cannot be moved by any further reasoning on the subject of classification.



other; if they did so, they would not simply cross the district but would make a circuit of both districts, and they must travel with the express object of making a complete circuit of this very large province. Churches in the north would not naturally be affected in the same way as those in the south, even if similar influences were applied to them; and it would not be a probable or natural issue that both groups should act together or secede in a common movement from the gospel of Paul.

The Apostle's letter, therefore, was written either to the churches of the north or to those of the south, but not to both; and there can be no excuse for interpreting 'the churches of Galatia' in that Epistle in a different sense from that in which Paul mentions those congregations and their liberality, when he writes to the Corinthians. Therefore only one body of 'churches of Galatia' is mentioned in Paul's letters, viz. either the Southern or the Northern.

Nor can there be any reason for thinking that, if there really existed two distinct and separate groups of Galatian churches, Paul would mention only one of them and ignore the other, or that he would ask only one of these groups to contribute and praise their liberality in contributing. If only one group contributed, the names of those who took charge of the money to Jerusalem prove that it must have been the southern churches that contributed. It would be absurd to suppose that the northern churches alone contributed, and sent their money under charge of delegates from the southern non-contributing churches. Such a supposition would imply either that the southern churches had fallen away from Paul, or that those three southern delegates had come to occupy a position of intimacy and even of superintendence in relation to the northern churches. No circumstance lends probability to either supposition. Nor is there any reason to think that the southern churches fell away from the Pauline gospel, and ceased to be regarded by Paul. Antioch and Iconium were leading churches in the earlier Christian centuries, both evidently with a long previous Christian career; and Paul's words in speaking about Antioch and Iconium and Lystra to Timothy do not suggest that the writer felt (or knew about) any estrangement.

Now comes the question whether he could call Antioch, Lystra, etc., churches of (the province) Galatia. We have quoted the emphatic statement

of Professor Harnack, that 'Paul's range of activity was regulated by the provinces: Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, etc., were ever in his mind's eye' . . .; and that he 'massed together the congregations of a single province': i.e. he massed together Antioch and the other three churches in the Galatic province, as the higher unity of which they all were members. The case, as stated in Dr. Harnack's words, is clear. He gives quite absolutely the shortest and simplest statement of the fundamental principle on which the South-Galatian view is based, viz. that Paul classified by provinces, and thought in provinces, and regulated his constructive organization according to the political divisions of the Roman Empire.

Why, then, is not Dr. Harnack definitely of the South-Galatian opinion?<sup>1</sup> Let him who asks the question turn to the maps in his second edition of the *Mission und Ausbreitung*, and he will see the reason. The provinces there displayed correspond to the facts of no period, they are not right either in names (e.g. Mysia) or in number, or in bounds. Already in studying his first edition, I marked several places in which his reasoning (quite unconnected with Galatia) showed some underlying misconceptions about the provinces. For a time I contemplated the writing of a review from the geographical side; but it is always painful to point out slips in a work that one admires and to which one is deeply indebted, and I left the review unfinished. The misconceptions appear in the maps. The provinces are stated as practically the same in number and bounds in Map II., A.D. 325, and Map I. before A.D. 180. No attention is paid to the total change caused by the reorganization of Diocletian, (about) A.D. 295; the provinces are too few for 325, and too many for 180. It was not easy to make the maps clear.<sup>2</sup> Our knowledge of Asia Minor has made such rapid progress in recent years, that it is difficult to keep

<sup>1</sup> I have always understood that he inclined to the North-Galatian view, but in his second edition of the *Mission und Ausbreitung*, ii. p. 180, he is more inclined to the South-Galatian view than in Dr. Moffatt's translation of the first edition. See above, p. 63 (where I have wrongly mentioned p. 387 instead of 180).

<sup>2</sup> The imperious need of economy in publication ordained that Maps I. and II. should be printed from the same plate, hence there is no variation in bounds, etc., but only in colour; only the city-names are mostly cut out of II. A plate can be altered by cutting out, but not by adding new details. Something might have been done by the use of different type to indicate changes at important epochs.

pace with its growth; but still the main facts about the provinces have remained fixed and certain. Before A.D. 180 the only provincial change which could affect the Pauline churches was that Derbe became part of the Tres Eparchiæ, Cilicia-Lycaonia-Isauria (about A.D. 138, or shortly after). Otherwise all the Pauline churches of Asia Minor (setting aside Tarsus, which was perhaps pre-Pauline) continued to be either in the province Asia (which was unaltered) or in the province Galatia. But Dr. Harnack's map classes them to five provinces, Lycaonia (Derbe, Lystra, Iconium), Pisidia (Antioch), Galatia (no names except Ancyra), Asia (Troas, Ephesus), Phrygia (Laodiceia, Hierapolis, Colossæ). He feels a little hesitation about Phrygia, which he marks by type as a province, but does not separate by a boundary from Asia—not even in 325—yet his footnote in the second edition, vol. i. p. 387,<sup>1</sup> implies that it was a separate province; and in ii. p. 179f. he calls Phrygia and Lycaonia provinces, though he adds that there occurred much change in this respect.

Thus the fact remains that his principle is

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Moffatt in his translation seems to have felt that there was something wrong here, for he renders 'Phrygien' as 'district of Phrygia'; but while this is in a way more accurate, it vitiates Harnack's argument, which is that, because Laodiceia was in Phrygia, it could not be in the province Asia. Laodiceia was in the district Phrygia of the province Asia.

perfectly right, but its geographical application is not consistent, owing to uncertainty about the relation between districts and provinces. Paul classed the four churches according to the province to which they belonged, viz. Galatia; and the entire body of the Pauline churches are classed to the four neighbouring provinces, Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia, a well-marked and continuous area, which included a very large part of what was most highly civilized in the world at that time.

Those who reject the South-Galatian view must reject also the principle, which Dr. Harnack has stated in such broad and simple terms; and they ought also to explain why and when this principle which Paul rejected was adopted by the Church, so that it governed all subsequent organization. On the other hand, if you admit Dr. Harnack's principle, and apply it according to our growing knowledge of Asia Minor, then everything is clear, simple, and continuous in development.

Since, however, difficulties are felt, let us take the questions that have been raised. Some are just and illuminative, some the result of ignorance. (1) Was the province called Galatia? (2) Could the people of the whole province be slumped together as 'Galatians'? (3) If Paul used the name Galatia, why did not Luke use that name?

The answer to these questions involves some antiquarian details, which I shall cut as short as possible.

## Contributions and Comments.

### A new Hebrew Grammar.<sup>1</sup>

THE Hebrew Grammar before us, as the Preface informs us, is 'an attempt to supply a want suggested by the experience of two Lecturers for the first part of the Theological Tripos at Cambridge.' As the result of a careful reading of the book right through, it may be confidently said that it will fulfil its purpose. Of course we in Scotland have our own Introductory Hebrew Grammar by the

late Professor A. B. Davidson, which does not suffer by comparison with the present work and will certainly not be superseded by it. At the same time the two books admirably supplement one another, and soon those who possess Davidson's Grammar will learn something by comparing it with the new Grammar. The authors have arranged their material well; the exercises are admirable; and the whole scheme of the book is excellently fitted to introduce students to an intelligent study of the Old Testament. The mysteries of *vav consecutive* are treated with clearness, as well as the somewhat puzzling use of the numerals in Hebrew, and great pains have been taken to exhibit the use of the verbal suffixes and the formation of the conjugations of the various

<sup>1</sup> *A Hebrew Grammar*, by the Rev. T. C. Wood, M.A., Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer of Queens' College, Cambridge, with the Co-operation of Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., formerly Fellow and Lecturer of Pembroke College, Cambridge. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1913. Price 5s. net.



classes of verbs. The Appendix on the Hebrew vowel system by Professor Kennett is of special value. One remark in the Preface has much truth in it: 'The best way to learn Hebrew Syntax is to read the Hebrew text with a commentary and a conscience.' In some Grammars the student is burdened far too much with syntactical rules. No doubt a certain measure of guidance is needed, but more can be learned through wide reading and discovering the syntax for oneself than by learning rules and seeking to apply them to the text.

Any one who desires to master Hebrew must make up his mind to slow and patient work, but the authors of the present Grammar have certainly lightened the student's task as far as this can be done. In view of a second edition, which is sure to be called for, we venture to suggest a very careful re-reading of the text, especially of the Hebrew words, in which not infrequently a vowel sign or a *sheva* is wanting. Of actual misprints or *lapses calami* we have noted surprisingly few, but we may call attention to הָטִי in place of הָטִיָּה on p. 182, Vocabulary, line 4 of right-hand column.

Aberdeen.

J. A. SELBIE.

### Psalm xc. 3.

THE meaning of an illuminative text (Ps 90<sup>3</sup>) is obscured by a curious mistranslation perpetrated also in R.V. הָיִיב אֱנוֹשׁ עֲדִידָכָה רָכָה may, as is well known, mean either 'destruction' or 'contrition,' and I venture to think the latter is the true rendering. The rules of Hebrew poetry are fulfilled, and the full sense of the verse becomes apparent. 'Thou turnest man to contrition; again thou sayest, Return, ye children of men.' It is indeed quoted thus by H. Polano in his little book on the Talmud. The word is elsewhere translated 'contrite' (Is 57<sup>15</sup>).

S. C. KIRKPATRICK.

Lisard.

### Knowing Christ κατὰ σάρκα.

It would appear that St. Paul's famous declaration, 'Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more' (2 Co 5<sup>16</sup>), is still very generally regarded as equivalent to a relative disparagement of the days of our

Lord's mortality. A reference to the verse in this sense occurs in a first-rate work of modern scholarship, *The Cambridge Biblical Essays* (p. 424). There has appeared no treatment of the passage in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for many years past. In vol. vi., however, on pages 148-152, an explanation is offered which, as far as it goes, is closer to the context than the generally received interpretation. This note is intended as a supplement thereto.

The first duty in handling the verse is to collate the Pauline uses of κατὰ σάρκα. These fall under two heads: (1) those we may call *historical* uses, and (2) those that involve an *ethical* meaning. Of the first we have the following:—

Ro 1<sup>3</sup> (Jesus Christ) 'born of the seed of David, κ. σ.'

Ro 4<sup>1</sup> 'Abraham our forefather κ. σ.'

Ro 9<sup>3</sup> 'My kinsmen κ. σ. who are Israelites.'

Ro 9<sup>5</sup> 'of whom (Israel) is Christ κ. σ.'

1 Co 10<sup>18</sup> 'Behold Israel κ. σ.'

Eph 6<sup>5</sup>, Col 3<sup>22</sup> 'them that κ. σ. are your masters.'

(Gal 4<sup>23</sup> 4<sup>29</sup> belong to allegory, and may be classified indifferently.)

If these passages stood alone they would help to justify the explanation that 'knowing Christ κ. σ.' was knowing Christ in His mortal life. (But see EXPOSITORY TIMES, vi. 151, concerning the order of the Greek.)

We have, however, (2) an *ethical* use of the phrase in the following:—

Ro 8<sup>4</sup> 'who walk not κ. σ., but after the Spirit.'

Ro 8<sup>5-13</sup> 'they that κ. σ. do mind the things of the flesh. . . . For the mind of the flesh is death,' κ.τ.λ.

1 Co 1<sup>26</sup> 'not many wise κ. σ.'

2 Co 1<sup>17</sup> 'the things that I purpose, do I purpose κ. σ.?'

2 Co 10<sup>2,3</sup> 'if we walked κ. σ.' 'We do not war κ. σ.'

2 Co 11<sup>18</sup> 'Seeing that many glory κ. σ.'

We have thus about an equal number of passages in each category, and the question to which 2 Co 5<sup>16</sup> belongs must be settled by context. The view of the verse most expositors have taken may be stated in the words of Meyer, 'He who knows no one κ. σ. has entirely left out of account, e.g. in the Jew, his Jewish origin; in the rich man, his riches; in the scholar, his learning; in the slave, his bondage; and so forth



(comp. Gal 3<sup>28</sup>)' (Meyer, *in loc.*). But there is no trace that Gal 3<sup>28</sup> was in Paul's mind here at all. The situation at Corinth was very different from that which is dealt with in Galatians. (See Ramsay's *Historical Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians*, § 2, for an admirable statement of the contrast.) One sign of this lies in the fact that *νόμος* occurs in Galatians 32 times as against 9 times in 1 Cor. and not once in 2 Cor., although in length Gal. is about one-third of 1 Cor. and three-fifths of 2 Cor. The whole of this fifth chapter of 2 Cor. is an appeal not from questions of the Judaizing controversy dealt with in Gal., but from the somewhat low moral ideal of their duty held by the Corinthians to the Eternal World and the Judgment-seat of Christ (vv. 1-10). Enforcing this appeal the Apostle writes, 'Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men.' He strikes a note of entreaty, repeating it passionately in v. 20. And justifying this passion, Paul writes the ever-memorable words about that constraining love of Christ which leads Christian men to live 'not unto themselves, but unto Him . . .' Then in *this* connexion he declares, 'Wherefore we henceforth know no man κ. σ.' There is no question in the context of knowing men by their exterior, their station, or their race, as Meyer assumes. There *is* a question of knowing men selfishly or unselfishly. And what is so completely κ. σ. as a self-interested intercourse with men? If we want to know Paul's idea of the carnal orientation of the mind, we have it in 1 Co 3<sup>3,4</sup> ('jealousy and strife'), cp. 1 Co 1<sup>12</sup> and in 2 Co 12<sup>20</sup> ('strife, jealousy, wraths,' κ.τ.λ.). Further, when we closely examine the situation at Corinth, as reflected especially in 2 Cor., have we not abundant evidence of a certain self-regarding spirit amongst the members, and even meanness in reference to the needs of others? Take the following passages as illustrating this position:—

2 Co 7<sup>2</sup> 'Open your hearts to us.'

2 Co 8<sup>7ff</sup>. 'But as ye abound in every thing, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all earnestness, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also' (*the ministering to the saints*), κ.τ.λ.

2 Co 9<sup>6</sup> 'He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly,' κ.τ.λ.

2 Co 11<sup>9</sup> 'When I was present with you, *and was in want*, I was not a burden on any man: for the brethren . . . from Macedonia supplied the measure of my want,' κ.τ.λ.

2 Co 12<sup>13,14</sup> 'For what is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the Churches, *except it be that* I myself was not a burden

to you? forgive me this wrong. . . . I will not be a burden to you,' κ.τ.λ.

These passages show how concerned Paul was with the low standard of Christian love that obtained amongst the Corinthians. Their promises and fair beginnings in the matter of the collection were not sustained by deeds of liberality. They needed to apply the doctrine of the Cross to all their intercourse with men. As it was, their knowing of men was a knowing κ. σ. They knew men only to exploit them. The references in the earlier Epistle to the four parties (1 Co 1<sup>12</sup>), taken with the evident forwardness and self-assertion of many of their number, show how even honoured names in the Church were known κ. σ., that is, for purposes of self-aggrandizement and pride in those who followed them.

It may still be asked, however, how is it ever possible for a man not to know Christ self-interestedly? In what sense could we ever be said to *exploit* our Lord? The answer in part lies in the fact that there was the 'Christ party' at Corinth, a party of persons who, perhaps—for travel was frequent—had had a knowledge of our Lord's ministry in Galilee or in Jerusalem, which they were apt to quote for their own self-gratulation and éclat. And Paul would not disparage their having known Christ *in* the flesh, but he would condemn their knowing *after* the flesh. (*Ἐν σαρκί* and *κατὰ σάρκα* are contrasted in 2 Co 10<sup>3</sup>.) And again, have there not always been those who have sought the fellowship of the Church as the Jews sought our Lord in Galilee, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate of the loaves and were filled? There are those still whose piety has the *σάρξ* strain running through it, who even in the pursuit of salvation mind only their own things and not also the things of others. On the other hand, to the man who in his passionate evangelism entertained the thought of being anathema from Christ for his brethren's sake (Ro 9<sup>3</sup>), uttermost devotion could reach even this daring height, 'I will try to know Christ as He has taught me by His Cross to do, selflessly, not seeking so much to receive from Him as to give to Him, and to direct all my devotional life into the channels of service and self-surrender, because He has given His all to me. I will not know even Christ (*καί* marks the writer's sense of an extreme position, so that only an extreme interpretation will do justice to the thought)—I will not know even *Christ* merely for what I can get out of Him. Wherefore, if any man is in Christ there is a new creation.'

A. D. MARTIN.

Edinburgh.



## Entre Nous.

### Index to The Expository Times.

A volume has been prepared containing Indexes to the first twenty volumes of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It contains—

(1) A complete List of the Authors who have contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES during these years, and the titles of their contributions.

(2) A complete Index to the Subjects dealt with.

(3) A selected (but very full) List of Books reviewed—making a valuable bibliography of twenty years' theological literature.

(4) All the Hebrew and Greek words whose meaning has been discussed or upon which some light has been cast from Assyriology and other studies.

(5) An Index to the Texts of Scripture.

These Indexes have been most carefully prepared and verified. The Indexes to the separate volumes have not been used; the whole work has been done afresh from the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The author of the volume is the Rev. James Donald, M.A., D.D., Keith-hall, Aberdeen.

The volume will be published this month. It will range in size with the volumes of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Only as many copies will be printed as have been ordered at the time of going to press, and the book will not be reprinted.*

Even those who possess only a few volumes of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will find the Index a great saving of time. And not only will it save time, it will also suggest notes and expositions and illustrations which no one would think of going hunting for through the volumes, but which will be of immense service to the student of the Bible and the preacher. It is just such a magazine as THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that requires an Index.

Let it be understood that after the publication of the book, it will be quite impossible to purchase a copy of it—unless, of course, from second-hand lists, in which the price charged will certainly be more than the publication price.

The price of the volume will be 6s. net.

### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. A. B. Holliday, Liverpool.

Illustrations of the Great Text for May must be received by the 1st of April. The text is Ac 3<sup>19</sup>.

The Great Text for June is 1 Co 6<sup>19, 20</sup>—‘Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.’ A copy of Thorburn's *Jesus the Christ*, or Clifford's *The Gospel of Gladness*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for July is Jn 3<sup>8</sup>—‘The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.’ A copy of Royce's *The Sources of Religious Insight*, or of Bliss's *The Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine*, or of any two volumes of the ‘Short Course’ series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is Ps 31<sup>15</sup>—‘My times are in thy hand.’ A copy of Thorburn's *Jesus the Christ*, or any volume of ‘The Scholar as Preacher’ series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is Ac 11<sup>24</sup>—‘For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.’ A copy of Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, or of any volume of the ‘Scholar as Preacher’ series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.